

The Signs of the Times, vol. 13

esr

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1887	10
January 6, 1887	10
“A Few Principles of Interpretation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.	10
“The Underlying Motive” The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.	11
“Manner of Christ’s Coming” The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.	11
“A Fulfilling Parable” The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.	12
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.	14
“The Signs for 1887” The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.	15
January 13, 1887	17
“The Primary Idea of Sunday Observance” The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.	17
“The Bible, Commentaries, and Tradition” The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.	18
“Prisoners and Freeman” The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.	20
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.	21
“Unreliable” The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.	23
“Salvation Army Methods” The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.	23
“The Sure Word (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.	24
January 20, 1887	26
“Safety in the Time of Trouble” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	26
“Sunday the First Day” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	27
“Churchly Iniquity” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	27
“A ‘Non Sequitur’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	28
“Lot’s Choice” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	29
“Good and Bad Angels” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	29
“Men Never Become Angels” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	30
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	30
“The ‘Larger Hope’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	31
“Bible Justice Vindicated” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	31
“‘The Gospel Manual’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.	32
January 27, 1887	33
“Things We Should Know.—No. 1” The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.	33
“Laborers in the Vineyard” The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.	34
“The Day of Salvation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.	35
“Christ the Archangel” The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.	36
“Christ, Angels, and Men” The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.	36
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.	37
“Driving to Church on Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.	38
February 3, 1887	39
“A Weighty and Timely Utterance” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.	39
“The Curse of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.	40
“Is It Peace?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.	41
“The Nations Are Angry” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.	42
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.	42
“The ‘True Educator’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.	44
February 10, 1887	45
“Things We Should Know.—No. 2” The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.	45
“‘Barkis Is Willin’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.	46

"A Weighty and Timely Utterance" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.	47
"AFTER EIGHT DAYS," PENTECOST, AND TROAS	47
"Holiness of Angels" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.	49
EVIL ANGELS	50
CARE OF GOOD ANGELS FOR MEN	50
"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.	51
"No Sunday Law for California" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.	52
"The Great Strike in New York" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.	52
February 17, 1887	54
"Human Law Against Divine Law" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.	54
"Infant Baptism—An Explanation" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.	55
"My Lord Delayeth His Coming" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.	55
"2 Peter 3:10" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.	56
"A Weighty and Timely Utterance.' (Continued.)" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.	57
"Immortality of Angels" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.	59
"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.	61
"Sunday in Massachusetts" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.	62
February 24, 1887	63
"Concealed Infidelity" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.	63
"A Weighty and Timely Utterance" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.	63
"Is It Strange?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.	65
"Scripture Statements vs. Conjecture" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.	66
"The Lord's Prayer" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.	66
"OUR FATHER"	67
"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.	68
"A Sign of the Times" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.	70
March 3, 1887	71
"The Coming of Christ" The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.	71
"A Weighty and Timely Utterance" The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.	71
THE FATHERS—THEIR UNRELIABILITY	71
TESTIMONY OF "BARNABAS"	72
"Sunday-Law Meeting in Oakland" The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.	74
"Andrews' History of the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.	76
"The Lord's Prayer. 'Who Art in Heaven'" The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.	77
"WHO ART IN HEAVEN"	77
"HALLOWED BE THY NAME"	78
"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.	78
March 10, 1887	81
"A Weighty and Timely Utterance.' (Continued.)" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.	81
TESTIMONY OF IGNATIUS	81
"Something New But Untrue" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.	83
"Discrediting Prophecy" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.	84
"Unconcealed Infidelity" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.	84
"The Lord's Prayer. Thy Kingdom Come" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.	87
"THY KINGDOM COME"	87
WHAT THE KINGDOM IS	87
SETTING UP OF THE KINGDOM	88
"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.	89
March 17, 1887	92
"The Law and the Gospel" The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.	92
"A Weighty and Timely Utterance.' (Continued.)" The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.	92
THE FATHERS AND THE EARLY CHURCH	92
"Why We Keep the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.	95

“Saturday or Sunday” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.	95
COMMENTS ON THE ABOVE	96
THE SABBATH NOT LOST	98
SUNDAY AND THE “MAN OF SIN”	98
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.	100
“A Seasonable Warning” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.	100
“Sabbath Observance by Law” The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.	101
March 24, 1887	102
“Object of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.	102
“‘A Weighty and Timely Utterance.’ (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.	103
“The Seventh Day of the Week” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.	104
“The Lord’s Prayer. Thy Will Be Done” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.	105
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.	106
“‘The Seventh Day Is the Sabbath’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.	107
“Training Up Criminals” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.	108
“Beginning of the Day” The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.	108
March 31, 1887	110
“Fearing the Lord and Serving Idols” The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.	110
“Creation and Redemption” The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.	111
“The Lord’s Prayer. Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread” The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.	113
“GIVE US THIS DAY OUR DAILY BREAD”	113
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.	115
“The Arbitrator of Europe” The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.	115
April 7, 1887	117
“The Day of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.	117
“Questions and Answers” The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.	118
CHRIST SOON TO RETURN	118
“Union for the Sake of Peace” The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.	120
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.	120
“Chart of the Week” The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.	120
“Signs of the Times” The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.	121
April 14, 1887	122
“The Unpardonable Sin” The Signs of the Times, 13, 15.	122
“‘The Old Is Better’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 15.	123
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 15.	124
“Spiritualism a Delusion” The Signs of the Times, 13, 15.	125
“A Critical Period” The Signs of the Times, 13, 15.	126
April 21, 1887	127
“Sunday Laws in Tennessee” The Signs of the Times, 13, 16.	127
“The Unpardonable Sin. (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 13, 16.	127
“Present and Future Probation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 16.	129
“‘Christian Science’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 16.	131
“Where Are They?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 16.	131
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 16.	132
May 5, 1887	134
“Something Not Commanded” The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.	134
“The Lord’s Prayer. Forgive Us Our Debts” The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.	134
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.	136
“The Pope in Politics” The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.	137
May 12, 1887	139
“Can Inanimate Objects Talk?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.	139

“Women in the Church” The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.	140
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.	141
“Only an Echo” The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.	143
May 19, 1887	144
“Words and Thoughts” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.	144
“He Descended into Hell”	144
“The Lord’s Prayer. Lead Us Not into Temptation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.	146
“Liquor and the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.	147
“Conditional Immortality—What Is It?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.	147
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.	148
“A Significant Paragraph” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.	149
“Antichrist” The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.	150
May 26, 1887	151
“What and Where Is Paradise?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.	151
“One Probation Enough” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.	152
“The Days of Creation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.	153
“Within Thy Gates” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.	154
“Great Words” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.	154
“Ten Commandments” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.	156
THE INTRODUCTION	156
THE FIRST COMMANDMENT	156
SECOND COMMANDMENT	156
THIRD COMMANDMENT	157
FOURTH COMMANDMENT	157
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.	158
“Horrible Case of Hydrophobia” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.	159
“A Little Mixed” The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.	160
June 2, 1887	161
“Faith and Humility” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.	161
“They Stumbled at That Stumbling-stone” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.	162
“Exposition of 2 Corinthians 3:7-11” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.	162
“Importance of Obedience” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.	165
NOTES	167
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.	168
“Evolution vs. the Bible” The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.	169
June 9, 1887	171
“Blessed Are They that Do” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.	171
“Unity of the Eighth and Ninth of Daniel” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.	172
“The Commentary. God Requires Strict Obedience” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.	174
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.	176
“Sunday Labor and Morality” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.	177
“A Good Description” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.	177
June 16, 1887	179
“Born of God” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.	179
“What Is the Resurrection?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.	181
“What Absurd Thing Shall Come Next?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.	182
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.	183
“Making the Sabbath a Holy Day” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.	183
“Humility Wanted” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.	184
“Scripture Verified” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.	184
“Celibacy of the Clergy” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.	185
June 23, 1887	186

“Effects of Erroneous Opinions” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.	186
“The New Law” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.	187
“Faith and Works” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.	189
“The Lord Not Slack” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.	190
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.	191
“‘The Eighth Day’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.	193
June 30, 1887	194
“What Condemns Men?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.	194
“Cut Off from Among His People” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.	196
“Who Are the Sadducees?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.	197
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.	198
“The Truth Told” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.	199
“Is There Room Enough?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.	200
July 7, 1887	201
“The Question of the Sadducees” The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.	201
“We Have Abraham to Our Father” The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.	202
“The Baptism of Fire” The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.	203
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.	204
“Faith Healing” The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.	205
“Rome’s Work” The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.	205
“Trusting a False Guide” The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.	206
July 14, 1887	207
“The Growth of Evil” The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.	207
“The Sure Word” The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.	208
THE OBJECT OF PROPHECY	208
NEBUCHADNEZZAR’S DREAM	208
“Life and Death Everlasting” The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.	209
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.	210
“To What Profit?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.	211
“Only the Living Give” The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.	211
July 21, 1887	213
“Our Senses Not Infallible” The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.	213
“‘Baptized for the Dead’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.	215
“Virtue at a Discount” The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.	215
“The Gospel of the Kingdom, and the End” The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.	216
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.	217
“Not a Godless Nation?—Why Not?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.	219
“Puritan ‘Rights’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.	219
July 28, 1887	220
“That Cloud of Witnesses” The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.	220
“The Promise of His Coming” The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.	221
“Bible Exposition Against Human Speculation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.	222
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.	223
“More of Rome’s Work” The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.	223
“Prussia at the Pope’s Feet” The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.	224
“Owning the Responsibility” The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.	225
August 4, 1887	226
“The Besetting Sin” The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.	226
“Manner of Christ’s Coming” The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.	227
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.	228
“Intemperance Rampant” The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.	229

“Don’t They Know Better?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.	229
“Reckless Statements” The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.	230
August 11, 1887	231
“The Making of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 31.	231
“When Does the Sabbath Begin?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 31.	232
“Piety Without Display” The Signs of the Times, 13, 31.	233
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 31.	236
“A Vigorous Statement and Challenge” The Signs of the Times, 13, 31.	237
August 18, 1887	239
“The World Is Round” The Signs of the Times, 13, 32.	239
“Punctuation and Inspiration” The Signs of the Times, 13, 32.	240
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 32.	242
August 25, 1887	245
“Not ‘A Daniel Come to Judgment’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 33.	245
“British and Foreign Bible Society” The Signs of the Times, 13, 33.	247
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 33.	247
“Bogus Piety” The Signs of the Times, 13, 33.	248
“Not ‘Inferred’ But Believed” The Signs of the Times, 13, 33.	249
September 1, 1887	250
“The Logic of Lynching” The Signs of the Times, 13, 34.	250
“The Sabbath—For What, and to Whom?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 34.	251
“Solemn Warnings” The Signs of the Times, 13, 34.	253
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 34.	256
September 8, 1887	258
“What Constitutes Burial?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.	258
“The National Reform Association” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.	258
“Love the Fulfilling of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.	262
“California Camp-meeting” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.	263
“Religious Intolerance” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.	264
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.	264
September 15, 1887	266
“Preachers” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.	266
“‘That They May All Be One’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.	266
“Once a Sin Always a Sin” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.	267
“‘They Overpass the Deeds of the Wicked’” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.	267
“A CHURCH ENTERTAINMENT	268
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.	270
“What Shall be Done?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.	270
September 22, 1887	272
“Christ’s Coming and Kingdom” The Signs of the Times, 13, 37.	272
“A View of the Sabbath Day” The Signs of the Times, 13, 37.	274
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 37.	277
September 29, 1887	280
“Is There Such a Thing as Death?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 38.	280
“Baptism, According to Liddell and Scott” The Signs of the Times, 13, 38.	282
“Another View of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 38.	282
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 38.	285
October 6, 1887	288
“Why Will They Say So?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 39.	288
“A Superstitious Practice” The Signs of the Times, 13, 39.	289

“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 39.	291
October 20, 1887	294
“Short-sighted Reasoning” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.	294
“The California Camp-Meeting” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.	295
“Bible Study” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.	296
“Brief Comments” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.	296
THE CHARGE TO JOSHUA	296
HOLY THINGS	297
THE MIRACLE AT GIBEON	297
“Thoughts on John 10:27-29” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.	298
“Not a Prophet, But an Angel” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.	298
“Too Significant to Be Pleasant” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.	299
“Confessing Christ” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.	299
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.	301
“Humbug Legislation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.	302
October 27, 1887	304
“Information Wanted” The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.	304
“Who Is Responsible?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.	305
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.	306
“Not According to Law and Order” The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.	307
November 3, 1887	309
“The True Standard” The Signs of the Times, 13, 42.	309
“A Question of Principle” The Signs of the Times, 13, 42.	310
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 42.	312
“Judgment and Mercy” The Signs of the Times, 13, 42.	314
November 10, 1887	317
“Is There any Excuse?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.	317
“The Testimony of the Dying” The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.	318
“The Sabbath, the Lord’s Day” The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.	320
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.	321
“Arbitration or War?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.	323
“Entirely Too Familiar” The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.	323
November 17, 1887	325
“The Sabbath of Antiquity” The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.	325
“Analogy Not Proof” The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.	326
“The Relation of the World to God” The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.	328
“The Lord’s Prayer” The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.	330
The Commentary	330
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.	331
“The General Conference” The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.	332
LIST OF DELEGATES	332
“Words of Faith and Soberness” The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.	333
November 24, 1887	335
“General Conference Proceedings” The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.	335
SECOND DAY	336
THIRD DAY	338
FOURTH DAY	339
“Dreary Times” The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.	340
“The Ministers Aroused” The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.	341
“The Spirit of Antichrist. No. 1” The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.	342
“The Sunday and the Saloon” The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.	344
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.	345

“Laborers for the Harvest-field” The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.	346
December 1, 1887	348
“The Spirit of Antichrist. No. 2” The Signs of the Times, 13, 46.	348
“Items from the General Conference” The Signs of the Times, 13, 46.	350
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 46.	357
“Where They Draw the Line” The Signs of the Times, 13, 46.	358
December 8, 1887	360
“The Spirit of Antichrist. No. 3” The Signs of the Times, 13, 47.	360
“The Link Is Still Missing” The Signs of the Times, 13, 47.	361
“General Review” The Signs of the Times, 13, 47.	362
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 47.	364
“A New Book” The Signs of the Times, 13, 47.	366
December 15, 1887	367
“The Spirit of Antichrist. No 4” The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.	367
“A Holy Day, Not a Holiday” The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.	369
“Is It Temperance or Sunday?” The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.	370
“Catholics and Hungarians” The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.	371
“The Week of Prayer” The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.	371
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.	372
“Excessive Conscientiousness” The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.	373
“Alden’s Manifold ‘Cyclopedia of Knowledge and Language’ The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.	373
“Lesson Pamphlet” The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.	374
December 22, 1887	375
“Explaining Miracles” The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.	375
“The Deep Things of God” The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.	376
“The Sure Word” The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.	377
“A Desert Place” The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.	379
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.	379
“Good Words for Rome” The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.	380
December 29, 1887	382
“The Decline of Civilization” The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.	382
“The Sure Word” The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.	382
“Establishment of the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.	384
“Job and His Friends” The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.	386
“Creation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.	386
LESSON 1.—SABBATH, JANUARY 7	386
NOTES	388
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.	389
“The Promoter of Sin” The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.	390

E. J. Waggoner

The SIGNS OF THE TIMES is an expository journal. The main object for which it was established was to present Scripture truth in the simplest and clearest manner possible. During the coming year it will be our endeavor to make it meet this object more fully than ever before, and as a preliminary, we wish to lay down for our readers a few of the principles which we shall invariably follow in our interpretation, and which, if followed, in a prayerful and candid spirit, cannot fail to lead a person to a proper understanding of the sacred word. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.1*

1. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." *2 Timothy 3:16, 17.* We accept this fully, and apply it to the entire Bible. The Bible does not simply *contain* the truth, but it *is* the truth, and the whole truth. Aside from the Bible there can be no moral or spiritual truth and light. And whatever disagrees with the Bible, whether it be in the realm of morals or of science, must be false. The principle here laid down must underlie all sound Biblical exegesis. If this be not admitted, it can be of no use to any to study the Bible. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.2*

2. The Bible is one connected, consistent, harmonious book. It is composed of many books, but these books form only *one Book*. They are not independent one of another. This Book was written by many different persons, yet it has only one author, and that is the Spirit of God. The different parts are inspired by the same Spirit, and have one purpose; there is a vital connection between them. They are characterized by oneness of thought. As Christ prayed that his disciples might be one, so that the world might know that the Father had sent him (*John 17:21*), so the perfect harmony between the various parts of the Bible is proof that it came from God. If we accept the Bible as the inspired word of God we must expect to find it harmonious throughout, for God cannot deny himself. So whoever wishes to study the word of God with any degree of satisfaction, must first fix in his mind the fact that the Bible cannot contradict itself. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.3*

As a corollary to this principle it might be stated that the Bible does not need to be "harmonized." To attempt that is a thankless task, because the Bible is already harmonized. It is an instrument that was tuned by the Almighty himself, and every string vibrates in harmony with every other. All that the Bible student has to do is to study the harmony that already exists. If two texts *seem* to be contradictory, the student may rest assured that he does not understand one or the other, or perhaps either one. But when the position which he holds on one text is upheld by other texts bearing on the same point, and is not contradicted by any other text; that is, when a position taken in regard to any text is consistent with the entire Bible, that of itself is evidence that that position is correct; for the Bible could not agree with a false position. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.4*

3. The Bible must interpret itself. By the Bible man may be "*thoroughly* furnished unto all good works;" hence it cannot need the addition of matter outside of itself. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.5*

4. One part of the Bible cannot be fully understood when taken by itself, apart from its connection, or without reference to the remaining portion of the Bible. This might also be called a corollary to the second proposition laid down. If the Bible is one connected whole, then all the parts are necessary to the formation of that whole. There is a mutual dependence between all the parts, and therefore in considering one part, attention must be given to the other parts. True, we *may* not misunderstand one portion of the Bible even though we study it by itself; but it is certain that we cannot have a complete understanding of it until we study it with reference to the Bible as a whole. This principle is as true of an entire book of the Bible as it is of a single text. There is no book of the Bible upon which light is not thrown by every other book in the Bible. To say that any two books in the Bible have no connection, is almost equivalent to saying that the Bible is not all inspired by the same Spirit. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.6*

5. Terms used in one place in the Bible, with a certain signification, must have the *same meaning* attached to them *in every other place* where they occur, provided the same subject is under consideration. If this be not true, then we have no certain means of knowing what the Bible teaches. Let us apply this principle. In the eighth chapter of Daniel we find a symbolic prophecy in which certain days are mentioned. Now to say that these days mean literal days of twenty-four hours each, would make nonsense of the prophecy, for we should have several great kingdoms covering a period of only a little more than six years. But in *Ezekiel 4:3-6* we find another prophecy, also symbolic, in which a day is expressly declared to stand for a year. So we conclude that in every prophecy where a day is used as a symbol, it signifies a year. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.7*

In like manner we find horns used as a symbol in the seventh and eighth chapters of Daniel, in both of which chapters they are plainly declared to symbolize kingdoms. Therefore we justly conclude that whenever in the Bible a horn is used as a symbol, it represents a kingdom or nation. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.8*

Let the reader study these principles well, and get them fixed in his mind, and they will help him out of many a difficulty in his study of the Bible. We think these principles are sufficient for present consideration. Next week we shall present a few more that are equally important. *W.SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.9*

"The Underlying Motive" The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

The New York Observer of December 18, 1886, says:-*SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.10*

"We are glad to find the Central Labor Union of this city taking action on one point in line with the intelligent Christian sentiment of the country. This action is in regard to the enforcement of the Sunday laws. The present movement in favor of Sunday closing was undertaken, it is understood, partly in response to the appeals of labor organizations. These appeals were based, not on religious or moral grounds, but on the necessity to laboring men of one rest-day in seven. The friends of Sabbath observance will be pleased to receive help even up to this point." *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.11*

This is another proof of the fact that all classes of people are getting ready to unite in demanding a rigid observance of Sunday. The churches are, with few exceptions, a unit on this matter; the various temperance societies are pledged to it; Labor Unions and Knights of Labor are calling for it; even anarchists, all of whom are infidels or Spiritualists, are swinging into line. Surely there is need for some one to lift a warning voice against the tyranny that seems about to be imposed on the people. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.12*

The Christian Union of a late date also says:-*SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.13*

"It is very clear that if our Sabbath is to be preserved at all-and we are sanguine of its preservation-the non-religious sentiment of the country must be brought in to reinforce the religious demand for Sabbath rest; and it is increasingly evident that this is entirely practicable." *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.14*

Yes, that is very evident. But why should we, or anybody else, be compelled to accept a Sabbath which is not "ours." Those who claim Sunday as *their* Sabbath, may keep it if they will, but we don't own any Sabbath, and don't intend to own any. The Lord has a Sabbath, however, which he expects us to keep, and we intend to keep that, and no other. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.15*

But look for a moment at the selfishness of the proposed action in favor of Sunday. Here is a man who would like to keep Sunday, but who thinks that he cannot keep it unless they have a law compelling him to do so. The reason for this is that his neighbors do not keep Sunday, and if he rests on that day they will get ahead of him in business. To be sure there have been men who have been willing to lose everything in maintaining what they believed to be right, but his Sunday religion is not of that kind. And so, in order that he may not lose a cent by doing what his unenlightened conscience tells him he ought to do, he insists that his neighbors must be compelled to do the same thing, even though the enlightened conscience of some of them may tell them that they ought not to do so. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.16*

The whole Sunday movement is prompted in large measure, not by love for truth, or what is supposed to be truth, but by love of self. And inasmuch as the Sunday-sabbath is purely a human institution, having its origin in selfishness, this is as high a motive as we ought to expect. *W.SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.17*

"Manner of Christ's Coming" The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

The Bible furnishes a sufficient answer to every theological vagary that men can devise. One of the modern ideas is that the Lord has already come, and that Christians, or at least those who call themselves such, are already in the immortal state. This idea is not really new, for Paul had to combat it eighteen hundred years ago. Writing of profane and vain babblings he said: "And their word will eat as doth a canker; of whom is Hymenaeus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some." *2 Timothy 2:17, 18.* Indeed, if church history be diligently studied it will be seen that all the "new theology" of these days, is only a revamping of the musty ideas of the church "Fathers," who were really the "fathers" of all heresy. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.18*

But there is no dogma of modern spiritualistic theology that is more directly contradicted by the Bible than is

the one that Christ either has come the second time, or that he comes as often as a good man dies, or that in some way his second coming is a mysterious affair of which nothing can be known until it has taken place. In the chapter which contains the Sabbath-school lesson upon which comments are made in another column, we find the following plain and emphatic words of our Saviour himself:-*SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.19*

"Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before. Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." *Matthew 24:23-27. SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.20*

This one text is sufficient to enable any one to determine the literalness of Christ's coming. First, false christs will arise; men will say to us, "Christ is out here in the desert;" the command is, "Go not forth;" others will say, "He has appeared in such and such a meeting;" the command is, "Believe it not." But why may we not believe some of these tales? Why should we not investigate *all* of them, lest perchance Christ should come and we not know of it? Simply because he will not come in a secret manner. "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." No one can fail to see the vivid lightning flash that covers the whole sky; even though the eyes be closed, that wonderful glare cannot be wholly shut out. And the coming of Christ will be like the lightning's flash, for brilliancy, because he "shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels" (*Matthew 16:27*); or, as Paul says, "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire." *2 Thessalonians 1:7, 8. SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.21*

We said that no one can avoid seeing the vivid lightning flash. So no one can avoid seeing the Son of God when he comes. The apostle John says: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." *Revelation 1:7*. Although those who have rejected Christ will be loath to see him; although "they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth" (*Isaiah 2:19*), and will cry to the mountains and rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb" (*Revelation 6:16*), they will not be able to escape his piercing gaze, nor to shut out from their eyes his terrible and overwhelming glory. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 6.22*

In that day there will be no need of anybody's saying, "Lo, here is Christ, or lo, there." There will be no chance for mistake. "For the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God." *1 Thessalonians 4:16*. That trumpet's mighty sound will shake the earth; the graves will be opened; those who sleep in Jesus shall rise first, clothed in immortality, while the living righteous ones will be changed "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," and all together will be caught up to be forever with the Lord. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 7.1*

These events are near at hand. The signs in the heavens, which Christ announced as indicating his coming near, have been fulfilled. And now that we are in the time when Satan may be expected to work with "all power and signs and lying wonders;" when as an angel of light he will profess to be Christ, it is needful that we indelibly fix in our minds those truths concerning Christ's second coming, which alone will keep even the elect from being deceived. If we store our minds with the simple truths of the Bible, we shall have wherewith to unveil the deceptions of Satan; and thus God's word will be a light to our feet and a lamp to our path. *W. SITI January 6, 1887, page 7.2*

"A Fulfilling Parable" The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

**The Commentary.
(Sabbath, January 22.)**

"Now learn a parable of the fig tree; when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh; so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." *Matthew 24:32-34*. This parable occurs in the midst of one of the last discourses given by our Lord. As indicated in the heading of this note, the parable relates to the present time, and therefore claims our earnest attention. In order to appreciate its force, we must briefly glance at the preceding part of the chapter. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 10.1*

The twenty-third chapter of Matthew records the woes which Christ pronounced against the hypocritical scribes and Pharisees, and his prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, because of her rejection of all that

was good. When he went out of the temple, his disciples called his attention to the wonderful buildings of the temple, the pride of the Jewish nation. "And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." *Verse 2.SITI January 6, 1887, page 10.2*

"And as he sat upon the Mount of Olives, the disciples came unto him privately, saying, Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" *Verse 3.* Here we have two distinct questions. The first, "When shall these things be?" That is, When shall the temple be overthrown? The second, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" It is possible, and from the close connection of the questions seems quite probable, that the disciples supposed that the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple would be at the coming of Christ and the end of the world. But whether they thought so or not is immaterial. In his answer, Christ most plainly indicated that the two events were to be widely separate.*SITI January 6, 1887, page 10.3*

It is worthy of notice that the disciples did not question as to whether or not Christ would come again. They well knew that he was to come at the end of the world, when the resurrection would take place. See *John 11:24*. Their question had reference only to the *time* of his coming, and the signs which should indicate its nearness. So in the answer, to which the entire chapter is devoted, Christ does not proceed to teach them that he will come, but, considering that as well understood, he proceeds to tell how it may be known when his coming is near.*SITI January 6, 1887, page 10.4*

But first he utters a caution: "Take heed that no man deceive you. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." *Verses 4, 5.* In *verses 23, 24* he repeats this warning. On this point we can do no more at present than to call attention to the fact that Christ did not reprove his disciples for asking, "What shall be the sign of thy coming?" On the contrary, he gave a very full answer. Then surely it must be right to think about the time of Christ's coming.*SITI January 6, 1887, page 10.5*

The Saviour then presents a brief view of the world between the two advents, and mentions a few facts relative to the condition of the world in the time immediately preceding his second coming. Thus in *verses 15, 16* he answers the first question of the disciples, telling them when to expect the destruction of Jerusalem. Compare *Luke 21:20*. After that, "Then," said he, "shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved; but for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." *Matthew 24:21, 22.* This can refer to nothing else than the great persecution which the "elect," the people of God, suffered during the Dark Ages. Under Pagan Rome the saints suffered severely, but the persecution by the heathen was trifling compared with that practiced by professed Christians, after an apostate Christianity had been lifted to the throne of the world. The persecution of true Christians by professed Christians took place within the 1260 years of Papal rule, from 538 to 1798 A.D. At times the persecution was lighter than at other times, but all the time the saints were being *worn out*, until the Reformation had taken sufficient hold of the people to cause it to cease. This took place in the eighteenth century, some years before the expiration of the 1260 years of Papal supremacy. As the Papacy had not arrived at its full strength when it was exalted, so its power gradually waned until it was debased. And thus, those days of persecution were "shortened."*SITI January 6, 1887, page 10.6*

Right in the little season between the cessation of the great persecution and the close of the 1260 years, in 1798, occurred one of the notable signs of the second coming of Christ-the darkening of the sun and moon. Matthew records this as coming "immediately after the tribulation of those days" (*Matthew 24:29*); but Mark is more definite, and says that it should take place "in those days, after that tribulation." *Mark 13:24.* This was fulfilled in that supernatural darkening of the sun which cause May 19, 1833. True, there have been many light meteoric showers, but this was one the like of which has never been seen, either before or since, and can be fitly described only in the language of the prophet: "And the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." *Revelation 6:13.SITI January 6, 1887, page 10.7*

It was to these things that our Saviour referred in the text quoted at the beginning of these notes. When the fig-tree, "and all the trees," says *Luke 21:29*, puts forth leaves "ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand." No one needs to consult an almanac when he sees such signs; every one knows that they are sure precursors of spring. "So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand." *Luke 21:31.* Matthew (*24:33*) records it: "Know that it is near, even at the doors." We are not to guess, nor to imagine, but to *know*. We are commanded to be just as sure of it as we are that summer is near when the buds begin to swell. Who then can say that it is fanaticism to say that we know that the Lord is soon coming? To doubt that his coming is near would be to make Christ a liar. Let us not be found so doing.*SITI January 6, 1887, page 10.8*

"Even at the doors." This is given as an incentive to watchfulness and right living. Says James, using the

same figure: "Grudge not one against another, brethren, lest ye be condemned; behold, the judge standeth before the door." *James 5:9*. Who dare indulge in bickering and strife? The Judge standeth before the door, and if he should open it and find us engaged in contention, or nursing selfishness and malice and envy, how deplorable would be our condition! Of such an one Christ says: "The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." *Matthew 24:50, 51*. "Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." *Verse 42*. *W.SITI January 6, 1887, page 10.9*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

The evangelist, Dr. Graves, writes thus to the *Herald of Truth*, about his work in Los Angeles: "Brother Dorsey has baptized every Sunday since I closed labors there." Well, he may keep on baptizing every Sunday as long as time lasts, but he can never make it a Christian institution. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.1*

The *Catholic Mirror* says: "Strange as it may seem, counterfeit money, under the existing law, can be passed with impunity on Sunday." No doubt the law has an eye to the eternal fitness of things. Sunday being a counterfeit Sabbath, has doubtless an affinity for other counterfeits, and the law-makers have taken this into consideration. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.2*

In his last report to the *Christian Statesman*, Secretary Wylie tells of a National Reform meeting which he held at Akron, Ind., and says: "The meeting was spiced up with a few questions by a Seventh-day Adventist." That is all that he says of the matter. Now we now a few of his readers who would like to have a taste of that same spice. We have frequently read in the *Statesman* about questions propounded by Seventh-day Adventist or Seventh-day Baptists, but have never been favored with any of them. Why is it that they never go into the particulars of such cases? Perhaps if the brother who put those questions would send us the details of the affair, we might know why the spice of the meeting was not reported. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.3*

We are sorry to begin the new volume with an apology, but we are forced to do so. The type for our new dress was ordered weeks ago, but overland freight trains are uncertain, and the type did not come until long after it was due. Having made all calculations for the new type, we had no option but to wait for it. It did not arrive until after the time when the SIGNS usually goes to press. As soon as it came, we put on more than a double force, and by working without an hour's intermission, we have succeeded in getting the paper out only two days late. Under the circumstances we think we are to be congratulated for our promptness, rather than blamed for our delay, and we believe that our friends will be considerate with us. We intend after this the paper shall be furnished to our patrons promptly on time. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.4*

At the last meeting of the Congregational club of Chicago, the subject under discussion was the relation of evolution to Christianity. Rev. J. L. Scudder said that the influence of science upon theology had been profoundly good. He said it had "forced theology back into its own proper field," and even there had modified it for good by forcing it to become scientific in its own sphere. It will be noticed in this statement, that science has done all the crowding. Before it theology has meekly retired. It is now in "its own proper field." Formerly theology presumed to understand the first and second chapters of Genesis, but science taught it not to interfere with matters too deep for it. Other parts of the Bible are also wrested from the feeble grasp of theology, and made "clear" by science. Some parts of the Bible, are still allowed to be within the province of theology, but that theology has become so "scientific" that it has learned better than to believe that the Bible means what it says. Modern theology is getting to be pretty poor stuff; it doesn't amount to much either as science or as theology. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.5*

A correspondent of the *Christian Standard* says: "My conviction is that the Sabbath began at creation. It would be just as reasonable to say that the Lord's day began two thousand years after Christ's resurrection as to say the Sabbath began two thousand years after creation." That man's conviction is sound, but it should lead him a little farther. Why did the Sabbath begin at creation? The answer must be because it commemorated the finished work of creation. Then why should the Sabbath ever cease? Is it not as necessary for us to remember God's power and goodness as it was for Adam? It certainly is. "But ought we not to commemorate Christ's resurrection?" Most certainly; but we should do so in the divinely appointed way-by Christian baptism. That, and that alone, can fitly show our faith in the resurrection of our Lord. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.6*

A. G. C.-In the matter of what things are and what things are not allowable on the Sabbath, each one must be conscience for himself, taking the precepts in the Bible as a guide. Caring for domestic animals, feeding horses, milking cows, etc., is, of course, a necessary act, as it is an act of mercy. If a man is employed by a non-professor, we should suppose, under ordinary circumstances, that it would be proper for him to do such necessary chores on the Sabbath, especially if he lived at the home of his employer, and had the regular care of the animals. But these remarks would not apply to a case where there was no work but that of caring for

stock. We cannot see how a Sabbath-keeping could consistently engage to work for an unbeliever on a dairy or a stock ranch, and perform his regular daily work on the Sabbath. We do not think that *Ephesians 6:5*, *Colossians 3:22*, and *1 Timothy 6:1* apply to such a case as this. But we cannot tell people what their duty is in particular cases, even if we knew all the circumstances. Each one must make the application of principles for himself, being careful not to make too liberal an application when dealing with himself, however lenient he may be with others. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.7*

A correspondent asks what Paul has reference to in *1 Timothy 5:23*: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." The reference seems to be very clear. It seems that Timothy was not strong, and Paul advised him to use a little wine. There would be no trouble over this verse, if people had not imbibed the notion that the juice of the grape does not become wine until it ferments. This is a mistaken notion. The expressed juice of the grape is wine; if it has not fermented, it is sweet wine, just as the fresh juice of apples is sweet cider. Sweet wine is non-intoxicating, and is wholesome; it is often an aid to weak digestion. Therefore Paul advised Timothy to use a little of it. But fermented wine is not wholesome, and produces a decidedly bad effect on the stomach, and therefore we know that the text cannot have reference to fermented or alcoholic wine. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.8*

The New England Conservatory of Music, at Boston, Mass., conducted by Dr. E. Tourgie, proposes to give free instruction to those who are preparing for foreign work, who come bearing suitable indorsement. The instruction will include vocal and instrumental music, the art of teaching vocal music to children; a general knowledge of piano and reed-organ tuning and adjusting, such as will make it possible for them to meet the practical wants of isolated fields; and a knowledge of the fundamental principles of harmony, sufficient to enable them to arrange native music and write the accompanying parts. We feel sure that this generous offer will meet with a hearty response. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.9*

"The Signs for 1887" The Signs of the Times, 13, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

With the beginning of the volume we put on our new dress, we have a new type throughout, the general heading is new and enlarged, and the running titles, department heads, etc., are all new. In fact, everything about the paper is new, except the truths which it advocates; they are as old as creation, and yet even they are new. The columns have been slightly increased in length and diminished in width, thus giving the paper a more symmetrical appearance than formerly. The new dress has involved considerable outlay of means, but we have had in view, as at all other times, only a desire to please our patrons, and to make the paper one for which they could work with enthusiasm. We believe that the changes which we have made will materially aid those who are soliciting subscriptions. A canvasser ought to be able about to take subscriptions on the strength of the good looks of the paper alone. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.10*

But we do not design that anyone who may take the SIGNS OF THE TIMES because he is favorably impressed with its appearance and make-up, shall have occasion to revise his opinion when he begins to read its contents. We hope to make the SIGNS more readable than ever before, while at the same time Bible truth is presented in as clear and forcible a manner as possible. We think that this hope is not without good foundation, because, (1) satisfactory as the paper has been to his readers in the past, we see where improvements may be made; (2) correspondents who have heretofore helped give character to the paper, will still continue to enrich its columns; and (3) we have the promise from other able writers, that during the coming year they will contribute to the SIGNS. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.11*

The departments will be the same as heretofore. Under the head of General Articles, there will be each week an article from Mrs. E. G. White, which alone will be worth price of the paper. Besides this, there will be a good variety of contributed and selected matter. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.12*

The editorial department will contain expository articles, answers to questions on Bible subjects, brief comments on texts of Scripture, and notes on current events in the religious and secular world. While the SIGNS is purely a religious journal, the political kaleidoscope will be carefully watched, because in the actions of the nations of the world, divine prophecy is being fulfilled. True to our name, we shall always endeavor to discern and declare the signs of the times. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.13*

In the Missionary Department there will be reports from both the home and foreign mission field, with such descriptions of those fields as will make them and the work done in them seem more real to the untraveled reader. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.14*

The Commentary is really a branch of the editorial department, and will contain notes on the International lessons, and the comments on the Scripture covered by the lessons in the *Youth's Instructor*. It is designed to make this department invaluable to Bible students everywhere. *SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.15*

We shall still continue to furnish matter on health and temperance, which will be of practical value to every individual; and the Home Circle will, as ever, be instructive while it amuses the children or beguiles a weary hour for the parents.*SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.16*

In short, it shall be our aim to so conduct the paper that those who read it may be better fitted to discharge the duties which they owe to themselves, to their families, to their neighbors, to their country, and to God, and may be directed into the path of life the eternal. With this aim before us, we have confidence to ask our friends for their assistance in placing the SIGNS OF THE TIMES before many thousand new readers during the year 1887.*SITI January 6, 1887, page 16.17*

January 13, 1887

"The Primary Idea of Sunday Observance" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

Says the *Christian at Work*:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.1*

"As to Sunday itself, there ought to be no question as to the underlying motive for its maintenance by the State; with the religious features of the day the State has nothing whatever to do; the primary idea is Rest, with a very bit R-Rest for man and beast; that was the fundamental idea of its establishment by divine authority." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.2*

The editor of the *Christian at Work* should occasionally look over the files of his paper to refresh his mind as to what he has said in time past. No longer ago than February 18, 1886, he said:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.3*

"We hear less than we used to about the apostolic origin of the present Sunday observance, and for the reason that... it is now seen, as it is admitted, that we must go to later than apostolic times for the establishment of Sunday observance." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.4*

And on January 8, 1885, the *Christian at Work* said editorially:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.5*

"We rest the designation of Sunday on the church's having set it apart of its own authority. The seventh-day rest was commanded in the fourth commandment.... The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the *gradual concurrence* of the early Christian church; and on this basis, and none other, does the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, rightly rest." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.6*

Yet in the face of these candid admissions of fact, the same paper now speaks of the establishment of Sunday "by divine authority." We would like to ask a few questions: 1. Is "the church" divine authority for anything? 2. If it is, which part of the church has that exaltation? for it is well known that "the church" has many conflicting divisions, or as it is sometimes expressed, "There are many branches of our Zion." 3. Does the *Christian at Work* claim that "divine authority" rests in "the church" as a whole, and that, like the infallible Popes of Rome, it can make contradictory opinions equally true? or when it speaks of "the church" does it mean to be understood as referring to the Roman Catholic Church? 4. And if it means this, why does it not adopt all other festivals imposed by the same "divine authority"? *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.7*

The fact is, and the *Christian at Work* knows it very well, that there is no divine authority for Sunday-keeping. The fourth commandment is the only Sabbath commandment there is in the Bible, and that enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week, and of no other day. It is also a fact that the Bible is the only "divine authority" in the world, because it is the only revelation of the will of God. Therefore, it is also a fact that Sunday has no divine authority whatever, commanding it as a rest-day of any kind. Moreover, divine commands are never *gradually* given. The ten commandments were given at one time, by the voice of God. But evil has always come in by the "gradual concurrence" of those who thought their own way preferable to the will of God. The fact that the observance of Sunday instead of the Sabbath was "brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian church," after the days of the apostles, unmistakably stamps that institution as a product of the great apostasy. *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.8*

But granting the claim that Sunday was established by authority of some kind, let us notice the statement of the *Christian at Work*, that physical rest is the primary idea of that establishment. If that be the case, then no State has a right to enforce its observance upon those who do not feel like resting. Night is the time for sleep, but no Government has the power to enact that a man shall be forced to sleep, if he is not sleepy. If Sunday is only for physical rest, then the State has no more right to say that a man must rest upon it if he is not tired, than it has to say that a dose of morphine shall be given to every man who does not feel like going to bed at ten o'clock at night. But if the advocates of Sunday shall, in order to avoid this dilemma, claim that there is a religious idea also to the Sunday rest, then we still insist that the State has no right to enforce its observance, for civil Governments have nothing to do with matters of religion. Gallio of old had a just conception of the extent of his power as a civil ruler, when he said to the Jews who wanted him to condemn Paul:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.9*

"If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you; but if it be a question of words and names, and of your law, look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters." *Acts 18:14, 15. SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.10*

We leave Sunday worshipers to settle the matter among themselves as to the grounds upon which they observe Sunday, if it is possible to fix upon the "primary idea" of an institution that was established without precept. But for the Sabbath we can say that the primary idea in its establishment is worship, and not physical rest. The Sabbath was made for man, in order that he might know and remember God, and not for his personal ease. And here we will say that the man who labors so hard during the week that physical rest becomes of necessity the primary idea in his Sabbath observance, does not remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. If a man feels in need of physical rest and recreation, there is no objection to his taking it on Sunday; but there is a commandment from the Lord himself, for every man to rest on the Sabbath, and that without regard to the wants of his physical nature. *W. SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.11*

"The Bible, Commentaries, and Tradition" The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we gave a few principles of interpretation and promised to add a few more this week. As what we now wish to give is very intimately related with what has already been given, we will first recall those points. We noted first, that the Bible is absolute truth and that anything that disagrees with it in the slightest particular must be false. Second, that the Bible, though composed of many books, is one Book with one Author; that there is perfect harmony in all its parts. Third, that the Bible contains all truth, because that by it a man may be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works;" and that therefore it must be its own interpreter. Fourth, that one part of the Bible cannot be fully understood if taken out of its connection, or without reference to the Bible as a whole. There is no book in the Bible upon which light is not thrown by every other book in the Bible. On this point the following from Dr. P. S. Henson's introduction to the book, "Christ in the Gospels," is excellent:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.12*

"In what we call the Bible, God has given us many books penned by many writers, each presenting such views of truth as his mental and spiritual nature made him specially adapted to be the vehicle of. Not that anyone of these Scripture writers was left to wander at his 'own sweet will,' so that we must largely discount his deliverances on account of his human imperfections and the possibility of his misapprehending what the Lord would have him teach. That were indeed to undermine utterly the authority of the Scriptures, and 'if the foundations be destroyed what shall the righteous do?' We do most thoroughly and invincibly believe that 'holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' and that therefore what they spake may be absolutely relied upon. But while we believe that all that each one said was truth, God's truth, we do not believe it was all the truth. You must have *all* that *all* of them said, in order to be sure that you have all the truth. 'Which things we speak,' writes the apostle Paul, 'not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth, *comparing spiritual things with spiritual.*' And only by such collation and comparison can God's truth be comprehended in all the breadth and beauty of its meaning. You cannot obtain any accurate representation of a building by taking only a single view. As the photographer is accustomed to take two pictures, from a little different point of view, and when both these are looked at at once, as in a stereopticon, you see not two pictures, but one, and that not a flat surface such as each of the pictures shows, but a solid that stands out in its massiveness before your eyes. And yet even then you do not see the hinder part, but only half the building. To see it all in its completed symmetry, we should be obliged to have four views, and to look at them all at once. But this is, of course, impossible, inasmuch as we have not four eyes, but only two. But the principle applies, though its application be impossible. Singularly enough there are just four Gospels. The metropolis, lieth four square. Four pictures have we here of the matchless Man of Nazareth,-four pictures, and all so much alike that sometimes captious critics have said that there was only one original Gospel and the other three were copied from that. Four pictures, and yet all so different that other skeptical critics have alleged that there are glaring discrepancies in them that are hopelessly irreconcilable. The pictures, of course, must be *alike*, for all of them are pictures of Him. The pictures, of course, must be *unlike*, for each of the portrait painters had his own peculiar point of view. And yet it takes all four to give us the Christ of history in all the completeness of his humanity and divinity." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.13*

This is just as true of the whole Bible as it is of the four Gospels. Lastly, we showed that a term used in one place in the Bible must have the same meaning in every other place where it occurs, especially if the same subject is under consideration. *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.14*

Under the third proposition, that the Bible must interpret itself, we wish to say a few words on the use of commentaries. Commentaries may be a great help to the Bible student, or they may be a great curse. No matter how good a commentary may be, if a person relies implicitly upon it, taking all its statements as final upon any subject, he might better never see it, for he simply puts it in place of the Bible. Commentaries may be used only as they throw additional light on a point already established, or when the commentator leads to the understanding of a point, by unfolding to us the Bible evidence upon it. Many persons will quote a decision from Barnes, or Scott, or Clark, or Olshausen, or some other person, and rest satisfied with that. Now allowing that their statement of the case is correct, of what use is it to us if they do not show us the steps by which they arrived at such a conclusion; or how can we know that their statement is correct if we do not have those

steps? If the commentary does not lead us to the Bible then it is worse than useless. No matter how great a man may be, his opinion on a matter of Bible doctrine is of no account whatever unless it is backed by Bible evidence. And therefore in teaching others we should never quote commentaries for the purpose of biasing the mind or in any way influencing the judgment, before the Scripture has done its work. If a thing is true it may be proved by the Bible; if it cannot be proved by the Bible, it is of no consequence whatever, no matter who may hold it.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.15*

If a man relates to us an item of news, we almost invariably ask, "How do you know?" This does not necessarily indicate that we doubt his statement, but that we want to have the same ground for belief that he has. We should not be less anxious for trustworthy information on Bible subjects than we are on the news of the day. If a commentator makes a statement, he is in duty bound to tell us why he makes it, and we should demand this before we accept it. Otherwise we cannot be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." If the statement involves some duty, and we perform that duty, not knowing the full reason therefore, we shall be following some man, and not the Bible. The Bible then is the test of whether or not a man is a good commentator. If he proves every statement by comparing scripture with scripture, so that we can see for ourselves the reasonableness of his propositions, then his work becomes a blessing. If he does not, then, even though his statements be true, his work is of no account. He is like a man who climbs to the top of a building, and pulls up after him the ladder by which he ascended, but still expects others to follow him.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.16*

There is a growing and almost irresistible tendency to depreciate the value of plain Scripture statements. This is seen in the fact that when a direct Bible argument is given on some point that is new to the hearer, the first questions will almost invariably be, "Who believes this? What men have advocated this view?" Those who ask such questions are really exalting the human above the divine. They virtually say that the Bible needs human indorsement. We should have such confidence in the Bible that we will accept what it says no matter who, nor how many persons, may teach to the contrary.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.17*

Another point that should be firmly fixed, is that tradition should be wholly disregarded in interpreting the Bible. No matter how old a tradition may be, it should not be allowed to bias the judgment in the least. We cannot know whether tradition is true or not until we compare it with the Bible; and since we have to first examine the Bible to ascertain the truth of tradition, it is evident that tradition can be of no help to us in interpreting the Bible. We must first understand the Bible, before we can know what credit to give to tradition.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 23.1*

Many people suppose that those who lived nearest to the time when the Bible was written, must have known a great deal more about the Bible than we can. The popular idea of this is expressed by Rev. James Chrystal in his "History of the Modes of Christian Baptism," chap. 3, where, speaking of the testimony of holy Scripture, he says:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 23.2*

"This is the source of doctrine, but it should ever be interpreted by the historical witness of the earliest ages of the church. In other words, in case a doubt should arise regarding the proper interpretation of a passage relating to a certain doctrine or rite, we should not despise the voice of the early successors of the apostles. It is a principle of common sense as well as of sound criticism that the historical witness of the Christians who lived the nearest the apostolic age, is of the greatest importance in determining the meaning of obscure or disputed passages of the New Testament."*SITI January 13, 1887, page 23.3*

But it should be remembered that the apostles had no "successors." There have been a great many men who have lived since they did, but they have not been apostles. If nearness to the apostolic age gives extra light on the Bible, then those who lived at the same time that the apostles did ought to be still better guides than those who lived after they did; but we find that some of the gravest errors were taught by men who were contemporaries of the apostles. For a single example, see *2 Timothy 2:17, 18*. In closing this brief statement of principles, we would adopt the words of Dr. Killen, who speaks of the early church Fathers as follows:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 23.4*

"It would seem as if the great Head of the church permitted these early writers to commit the grossest mistakes, and to propound the most foolish theories, for the express purpose of teaching us that we are not implicitly to follow their guidance. It might have been thought that authors, who flourished on the borders of apostolic times, knew more of the mind of the Spirit than others who appeared in succeeding ages; but the truths of Scripture, like the phenomena of the visible creation, are equally intelligible to all generations. If we possess spiritual discernment, the trees and the flowers will display the wisdom and the goodness of God as distinctly to us as they did to our first parents; and, if we have the "unction from the Holy One," we may enter into the meaning of the Scriptures as fully as did Justin Martyr or Irenaeus. To assist us in the interpretation of the New Testament, we have at command a critical apparatus of which they were unable to avail themselves. Jehovah is jealous of the honor of his word, and he has inscribed in letters of light over the labors of the most ancient interpreters, '*Cease ye from men.*' The opening of the Scriptures' so as to exhibit their beauty, their

consistency, their purity, their wisdom, and their power, is the clearest proof that the commentator is possessed of 'the key of knowledge.' When tried by this test, Thomas Scott or Matthew Henry is better entitled to confidence than either Origen or Gregory Thaumaturgus. The Bible is its own safest expositor. 'The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is use, making wise the simple.'" -*The Ancient Church, section 2, chapter 1, last paragraph. W.SITI January 13, 1887, page 23.5*

"Prisoners and Freemen" The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

Being unable to furnish the current Sabbath-school lesson for the Commentary Department this week, we occupy a portion of the space answering the following questions which we have received:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.1*

"Who is addressed in *Isaiah 40:8*, 9? Who are the prisoners, and when and from what are they to be freed? P. B." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.2*

The verses referred to read thus:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.3*

"Thus saith the Lord, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee; and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages; that thou mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Show yourselves. They shall feed in the ways, and their pastures shall be in all high places." *Isaiah 49:8, 9. SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.4*

By reading the preceding verses in connection with these, we readily learn who is addressed. "And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him." *Verse 5*. "And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldst be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." *Verse 6*. These passages show unmistakably that Christ is the one addressed. Compare with *verse 6 Luke 2:29-32*. The eighth verse itself shows that Christ is addressed, in the words, "I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people." Compare with this *Isaiah 55:4, 5. SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.5*

The "day of salvation" is the entire time during which God's mercy to man is manifest in the gospel. In this day this acceptable time-Christ is heard in behalf of the people, and is given for the objects mentioned in *verses 8 and 9*. One of these objects is the opening of the prison, and saying to the prisoners, Go forth. It might appear to some, from the words that immediately follow (*verse 10*), that this has reference to the opening of the graves at the last day; but from almost identical language used elsewhere in prophecy, and applied by our Lord himself, we are obliged to place the opening of the prison within the "day of salvation." We quote *Isaiah 61:1, 2*: "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.6*

When our Lord went into the synagogue at Nazareth and read this much of the prophecy, he closed the book, and said to the people: "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." *Luke 4:16-21*. The fact that he said this, and that he refrained from reading the next clause, "and the day of vengeance of our God," -shows that all that he read is fulfilled in the day of grace. But the dead are not raised until the day of mercy is past. Therefore the "opening of the prison to them that are bound" must be during the "day of salvation." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.7*

Then we have to inquire, Who are bound, and what is their bondage? The following verses will set us in the way of the correction answer: "They [the wicked Jews] answered him, We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man; how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free? Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house forever; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." *John 8:33-36*. From these words we learn that sin is a bondage, and that it is from this bondage that Christ sets men free. To further show that sin is a bondage we need only to refer to *Romans 7:14* and *2 Peter 2:19*, out of a multitude that might be quoted. *SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.8*

Again, we know that Christ's special work is to save people from sin. See *Matthew 1:21*. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief." *1 Timothy 1:15*. "Looking for ... our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." *Titus 2:13*,

Both these points, namely, that sin brings men into bondage, and that Christ releases them from this prison, are brought out in the following passage:-SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.10

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which [*i.e.*, by the Spirit] also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." Christ, by the Spirit, went and preached unto the spirits in prison; this was in the days of Noah, while the long-suffering of God waited. God's long-suffering waited one hundred and twenty years, and during this time his Spirit was striving with the wicked antediluvians. See *Genesis 6:3*. Those wicked men were in the bondage of sin; Christ was ready and anxious to give them freedom,-the same freedom that Noah had, namely, the righteousness which is by faith,-but they refused to be made free, and were therefore destroyed.SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.11

Still further: We have seen that men are bound in prison because of sin. Said Paul, "The law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin." *Romans 7:14*. Now "sin is the transgression of the law" (*1 John 3:4*), and therefore it is the transgressed law that shuts men up in prison. David said, "I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts." *Psalms 119:45*. But when he turned aside from the commandments he was at once bound as a criminal.SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.12

This bondage in which the transgressed law holds its victims until they accept freedom in Christ, is most forcibly indicated by Paul in the following words: "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." *Galatians 3:22, 23*.SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.13

It is well known that human law casts its violators into prison. The sheriff who arrests the criminal, the judge who sentences him, and the jailer who locks him up, are only the agents of the law. The massive bolts and prison walls simply represent the outraged law. Now notice the parallel in the case of a transgressor of divine law. Having willfully sinned, he is justly accounted guilty of a violation of the whole law. *James 2:10*. For a time he is unconscious of his bondage. aid Paul, "I was alive without the law once." The office of the Spirit is to make men conscious of this bondage. See *John 16:8*. It does this by bringing the word home to their hearts, for the Bible is the Spirit's sword. Some, it is true, resist the influence of the Spirit, and never become conscious of their need until it is too late. But we will consider the case of one upon whom the Spirit works effectually. As the truth is impressed upon his heart, his prison walls seem to contract about him. Whereas before he thought he had unlimited freedom, he now finds that he is in a narrow cell, the walls of which are the ten commandments. He resolves that he will be free, and starts out in one direction. But he has taken the name of the Lord in vain, and the third commandment says, You can't get out here. He turns in another direction, but he has borne false witness, and the ninth commandment presents an effectual barrier to his escape in that direction. Whichever way he turns, a commandment, stronger than any earthly prison wall, drives him back. He is shut in on every side. But Christ is the door that ever stands open. Toward this door the inclosing walls seem to drive him, and he is shut up to it as the only avenue of escape. At last he escapes through this door, and becomes in Christ a free man. In Christ he is as though he had never sinned, and in him he is, "made the righteousness of God." That is, he becomes a commandment-keeper, and therefore continually walks at liberty. He has now only to stand fast in the liberty wherewith God has made him free.SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.14

One more point. Christ is the tower of the flock, "the stronghold of the daughter of Zion." *Micah 4:8*. Now turn to the exhortation of the prophet: "Turn you to the stronghold, ye prisoners of hope; even to-day do I declare that I will render double unto you." *Zechariah 9:12*. The blood of the covenant (*verse 11*) is still offered before the throne of God, and is powerful enough to set every prisoner free. Therefore we are all prisoners of hope. We may all be free if we will. No matter how high our sins may seem to be piled up against us, backed by the law of God, we need not despair, for the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin; and where sin abounds, grace doth much more abound." W.SITI January 13, 1887, page 27.15

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

On the morning of the 8th inst., Brother and Sister W. C. Sisley and child arrived in Oakland on the steamer from Portland, Oregon, where they had spent a few days on their way from Battle Creek, Mich. They would have arrived the day before, but for the fact that the steamer was delayed by fogs. Sister Sisley comes to take charge of the missionary instruction in the Healdsburg College, in which work she has had long experience, and Brother Sisley will devote a little season to the recovery of his health, which is very much impaired. We

heartily welcome this addition to our force of laborers on the coast.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.1*

Now that the holidays are over, we may expect to find something in our religious exchanges besides stories of feasting and gormandizing. One would almost suppose that the majority of the people of the United States had been kept on a starvation diet for several months before Christmas, and could think of nothing during the holiday season but something to eat. And this also is a sign of the last days; "for as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, and knew not until the flood came and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.2*

Quite recently three lodges of the Knights of Pythias, at Little Rock, Arkansas, united in a service of sorrow and season of prayer for the dead of their order. This was in accordance with a law of the Grand Lodge, enacted in 1884, making it obligatory to hold such a season of prayer for the dead once a year. At the service referred to, the hall was crowded, and the service was said to have been solemn, yet, "resplendent with beauty and pure thought for those who have gone, and for those who have yet to cross the dark river." It is said also that "the deep strains of the organ seem to tell those who heard it that there was a great beyond." We can heartily endorse the following comment by the *Christian Standard*:—*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.3*

"How can any enlightened Christian have fellowship with such superstition and mockery? If we are to trust what we have seen with our own eyes, these Knights of Pythias had better bestow their sympathies on the parents of *the living* of their order, that they may be kept from patronizing saloons and drinking freely of beer on their gala days."*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.4*

On the evening of November 28, while the General Conference was in session at Battle Creek, Mich., Dr. J. H. Kellogg, superintendent of the Sanitarium, delivered an address on "Social Purity," to an audience of over one thousand persons in the tabernacle. The substance of that address we have before us in a neat pamphlet of forty pages, which was published in accordance with the unanimous request of those who listened to it. That the subject of social purity is one which urgently demands attention must be acknowledged by anyone who reads even the head lines of the daily papers, or who knows anything of human nature. In this pamphlet the subject is presented in an earnest and faithful manner. The dangers existing at the present time are vividly set forth, and the means of escaping these dangers is clearly indicated; yet nothing is said that could shock the most fastidious, or in any way tend to awaken an impure thought. The address should be in the hands of everybody who reads anything. Single copy, ten cents; liberal discount on large orders. Address, Health Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Mich.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.5*

It is claimed by Sunday observers that Sunday should be kept in honor of Christ's resurrection. Then the same people will urge that laws ought to be made compelling all classes of people to rest on Sunday. This would, of course, include infidels and atheists. That is, they would have Christ's resurrection commemorated by those who do not believe in Christ. What else would that be but enforced hypocrisy? But some will say that by enforcing the memorial, as they claim, belief would eventually follow. That is to say, that if all the merchants in town should hang out signs advertising hardware for sale, their stores would in time fill themselves with hardware.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.6*

Says the *Oakland Tribune*:—*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.7*

"The year 1886 will long be remembered for its labor troubles and strikes. But, notwithstanding the universal strikes over the country, we have yet to learn of anything being gained by the strikers. We cannot recall a single instance where any advantage has been gained by a strike which might not have been obtained by negotiation."*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.8*

There is truth in this. A little consideration will show any thinking man that strikes and boycotts are not only violation of the golden rule, but they are disastrous to the parties engaging in them. Even when men succeed in getting an increase of wages by a strike, it will almost invariably be found that the increase does not compensate for the loss sustained in getting it. The grasping individual, as well as the grasping monopoly, usually overreaches to his own detriment.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.9*

In speaking of the main argument in favor of the "new theology," namely, that it is demanded by "the spirit of the age," the *New York Christian Advocate*, under the heading of "a cause for alarm," states the following fact, which is worth noting as a sign of the times:—*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.10*

"Nevertheless, the stubborn fact stands out too boldly to be denied—the church of Christ is so deeply infected by the peculiarity of the times as to be made weak thereby. Hence, instead of being able to authoritatively oppose, to successfully counteract, to effectually neutralize it, she is in danger of being shorn of her strength and robbed of her spiritual beauty by its subtle and continuous working."*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.11*

As was to be expected, the Andover professors who have been teaching the "new theology," that the probation of man does not cease at death, have the sympathy of all Spiritualists. The "new theology" is, in

fact, only one form of Spiritualism, and its advocates will surely find it that is ample scope for the exercise of their talents. It should be understood that the Andover professors are not being *persecuted* for their "advanced" ideas. The simple fact is that they have agreed, as a condition of having a position in the college, to teach in harmony with certain doctrines, and have violated their agreement. Probably some of the theories which they agreed to teach are as unscriptural as is their new departure, still that does not alter the fact that they have broken their pledge. But not withstanding the strictness of Andover rules, we venture the prediction that both accusers and accused will ere long be standing together again in the fold of Spiritualism. *SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.12*

"Sunday or no Sunday?" Is the way the advocates of a rigid Sunday law put the case. It is a very common thing to hear that "we have no Sabbath in California," since the Sunday law was repealed. Such expressions are simply admissions of the fact that the Sunday institution derives its support solely from human enactments, and that without such support there would be no Sunday sabbath. It is indeed a truth that those who ignore the Sabbath of the Lord, as enjoined in the fourth commandment, have now no sabbath in California, for the only thing which gave Sunday its religious character in this State has been withdrawn. But we have never heard any complaints from those who keep the seventh day of the week, "according to the commandment." Such ones find no difficulty in keeping the Sabbath, although there has been no civil law whatever enforcing the observance of that day; the law of God is found to be all-sufficient. If Sunday-keepers had so good a law in support of *their* institution, they would never clamor for an inferior one made by man. *SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.13*

"Unreliable" The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

To the editor of the *Golden Gate* (Spiritualist) says:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.14*

"Whoever surrenders his individual judgment, and places his trust implicitly upon the communications of spirits, as given through promiscuous mediumship, is almost certain to be deceived. It matters not how confiding his trusts, or implicit his faith, nor how sincere or honest he may be in his intentions, he will find the average spiritual message a broken reed, if he attempts to lean upon it to the exclusion of the staff of his own reason." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.15*

This is just what students of the Bible could tell any Spiritualist. The spirits which they consult are lying spirits, because "they are the spirits of devils." There must be to Spiritualists great comfort in listening to what they know to be lies. We prefer to listen to what we know to be truth. *SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.16*

"Salvation Army Methods" The Signs of the Times, 13, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

The Boston correspondent of the *Christian Union*, in reporting the visit of General Booth to that city, makes the following criticism upon the methods of the army. We think the criticism is entirely just. And as the National Reform party is now courting the Salvation Army, it can very readily be seen what a worthy accession the National Reform will gain when it shall have won the army. But the accession will be entirely worthy of the cause:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.17*

"The criticism which I make is not against his methods so much as against the positive way he asserts the salvation of those who go to his anxious seat to be prayed for. All the force of the meeting is directed to get sinners forward to be converted on the spot, even if they are half intoxicated. If they feel right, and submit, they are called 'saved.' They sing 'I am saved, I am saved.' The soldiers are taught to proclaim their own salvation. If they were called new recruits and the Salvation Army, and the process of beginning were called enlisting, it might not be offensive, but the positive assumption that one has been saved during the five or ten minutes of a special prayer, the scene having much that is *outré* and intensely exciting, is an exercise of the knowledge that only Omniscience has the right to assume. I am not criticising the fact that God can save men instantly when they turn to him in penitence and love, but only the great danger there is in the positive declaration that this peculiar process, which seems to me to have large admixtures of the mechanical, transplants men into assured salvation. After listening to General Booth, I almost regretted that I remained to witness the closing scene. The army is always demonstrative whenever the preacher alludes to those who have just been saved. To break new converts on a public platform with banners and march them through the streets as those who are 'saved' seems to me an arrogance that the Salvation Army should not encumber itself with. I recognize the power there is in their methods of appeal to the low and degraded, but the gospel inculcates modesty and humility, and converts ought not to be inflated by supercilious ideas concerning themselves, made boastful and left in danger of rushing headlong into spiritual pride, which is the most insidious foe to the Christian life." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 32.18*

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

The third chapter of the second epistle of Peter contains some positive evidence concerning the sure word of prophecy, which, as we have seen, points out the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. The chapter opens with the statement that the epistle is written for the purpose of stirring the brethren up to take heed to "the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets." There is special reason for this admonition, because just before the end, the darkness will be more intense, as the apostle Paul says, "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived." *2 Timothy 3:13*. And these evil men will scoff, saying, "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." *2 Peter 3:4*. That this is a falsehood, and that they ought to know better if they do not, Peter declares in the next two verses, saying:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.1*

"For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.2*

The phrase "the earth standing out of the water and in the water," does not at all express the idea of the original. The Greek word which in the Authorized Version is rendered "standing," should, as the margin indicates, be rendered "consisting." Robinson's "Lexicon of the New Testament," says of the word: "To place together parts into a whole, i.e., to constitute, to create, to bring into existence. Hence, in the N.T., intransitive, to be constituted, created; to exist," as in *Colossians 1:17*, "by him all things consist." Wakefield translates the passage thus: "A heaven and earth formed out of water and by means of water." Bloomfield says: "The earth... being formed out of water, and consisting by means of water." Murdock's translation of the Syriac has it: "The earth rose up from the waters, and by means of water, by the word of God." The meaning is that the earth in its chaotic state was simply a watery mass, as indicated by *Genesis 1:2*: "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.3*

"Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." When God gathered the waters together into one place, and made the dry land appear, he evidently stored large quantities of water in the interior of the earth. This is indicated in the second commandment, by the phrase, "the waters which are under the earth," and by *Psalms 136:6*: "To him that stretched out the earth above the waters," and also by *Psalms 24:1, 2*. In the flood which destroyed the earth in the days of Noah, the waters in the interior of the earth united with the rain from heaven, as the record says: "The same day were all the fountains of the great deep broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened." *Genesis 7:11*. The idea of the passage in Peter's epistle is that the very element from which the earth was formed, was made to contribute to its destruction. Having disproved the assertion that all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation, the apostle draws a parallel, thus:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.4*

"But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." *2 Peter 3:7*. Instead of "are kept in store reserved unto fire against the day of Judgment," a better translation would be "stored with fire, reserved unto the day of Judgment." Now the comparison is at once apparent. By the word of God, the earth, in the beginning, was formed from the watery mass which God had spoken into existence. Part of this water was stored up in the earth, and by the word of God was afterward caused to overflow the earth and contribute to its destruction. And the same word of God, which performed this, has stored the interior of this present earth with fire, and is keeping it till the day of Judgment, when, as in the case of the waters of the flood, the fire within the earth, uniting with that which comes down from God out of Heaven (*Revelation 20:9*), will destroy it. *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.5*

Particular attention should be given to the word "kept." Instead of all things continuing as they were from the beginning of the creation, the earth has within it the elements of its destruction, and it is only the power of God that stays the catastrophe. *SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.6*

Some have fancied that this chapter teaches that the earth will be annihilated at the Judgment-day. This is a mistake. This earth will be destroyed in the same sense that the original earth "perished" by the waters of the earth. It was all broken up, and the face of it was changed, so that the earth after the flood had no resemblance to the earth before the flood. This was the last and greatest curse caused by sin, and completed the desolation of the earth. But the matter which composed the earth was not destroyed. So by the fires of the last day "the elements shall melt with fervent heat," but they will not be annihilated. From those melted elements, "new heavens and a new earth" will be formed, which will have no more resemblance to this sin-

cursed earth than this earth does to Eden, the garden of God. The people that shall dwell in it will all be righteous (*Isaiah 60:21*); and "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing; the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God." *Isaiah 35:1, 2.SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.7*

The "sure word of prophecy" tells us again and again that this earth shall be destroyed by fire, and that in that fire the ungodly shall be burned up. Scoffers say that they see no evidence that any such event will ever take place; but the apostle Peter assures us that the instrument of the earth's destruction is already prepared, and is stored within it. Just as surely as the earth was once destroyed by water, so surely will it again be destroyed by fire.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.8*

"But these prophecies were spoken hundreds, and some of them thousands, of years ago, and there is no more evidence of their fulfillment now than there was when they were uttered." Thus argues the scoffer; but it is a vain argument; (1) because it is not true, and (2) because of the following statement:-*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.9*

"But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." *2 Peter 3:8.SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.10*

God "inhabiteh eternity." The flight of time makes no difference with his plans. Compared with his eternity, the entire 6,000 years of earth's existence are but a span. Says the psalmist, "For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night." *Psalms 90:4*. Therefore the apostle concludes that "the Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness." That which seems to men forgetfulness of the promise, is only a kindly delay to allow dilatory men to secure the promise. In God's reckoning, it is only as the three days grace which men allow for the payment of a promissory note.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.11*

It should not be forgotten that while a thousand years is with the Lord as one day, one day is as a thousand years. This is too often overlooked. While he may take a thousand years for the fulfillment of a promise, and then it will be the same as though performed the next day, he can do in one day the work of a thousand years. Therefore there is no warrant for settling down to carnal ease, thinking that it will necessarily be a long time yet before the work of God on earth can be accomplished. "For he will finish the work, and cut it short in righteousness; because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth." *Romans 9:28.SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.12*

Having now examined some of the prophecies concerning "the power and coming" of the Lord, we will next turn our attention to some of the prophecies that mark the progress toward the fulfillment of the promise. W.*SITI January 13, 1887, page 22.13*

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago, in an article on the punishment of the wicked, we quoted *Isaiah 33:14* as a text which is to some a stumbling-block in the way of their believing that the wicked are to be eternally destroyed. The text reads thus: "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" The difficulty arises from the supposition that the prophet means, Who of us shall suffer from the devouring fire, or in other words, Who of us shall in the last day be found sinners? But that is not the idea of the text. The true meaning is found when we read the answer to these questions, which is found in *verse 15*: "He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil; He shall dwell on high: his place of defence shall be the munitions of rocks; bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure." From this we learn that the prophet does not mean to ask who among us shall be sinners; but who among us shall be righteous. And, therefore, when he says, "Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" he does not mean to ask who shall be punished with this fire, but who shall escape it. Thus the text has no reference whatever to eternal torment. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.1*

But the question will be asked, How can it be said that the righteous shall dwell with devouring fire and with everlasting burnings? This will be understood after we have quoted a few texts. The psalmist, speaking of the coming of the Lord, says: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." *Psalms 50:3*. And again: "A fire goeth before him, and burneth up his enemies round about." *Psalms 97:3*. In *Habakkuk 3:3-6*, we find the following: "God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had horns coming out of his hand; and there was the hiding of his power. Before him went the pestilence, and burning coals went forth at his feet. He stood, and measured the earth: he beheld, and drove asunder the nations; and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow; his ways are everlasting." From the sixteenth verse of this chapter we learn that this is the description of the time of trouble that shall just precede the coming of the Lord. It is the same that is referred to in the ninety-first psalm, where we read of the "terror by night," the "pestilence that walketh in darkness," the "destruction that wasteth at noonday," and the plagues which the wicked shall suffer, and which the righteous will see although they shall be unharmed by them. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.2*

Now if with these texts we read *Joel 1:15-20*, which also describes the time of trouble, we shall understand about the devouring fire and the everlasting burnings. That text reads thus:-*SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.3*

"Alas for the day! for the day of the Lord is at hand, and as a destruction from the Almighty shall it come. Is not the meat cut off before our eyes, yea, joy and gladness from the house of our God? The seed is rotten under their clods, the garners are laid desolate, the barns are broken down; for the corn is withered. How do the beasts groan! the herds of cattle are perplexed, because they have no pasture; yea, the flocks of sheep are made desolate. O Lord, to thee will I cry; for the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness, and the flame hath burned all the trees of the field. The beasts of the field cry also unto thee; for the rivers of waters are dried up, and the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness." Read also *Joel 2:1-3*. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.4*

We find from this text that just before the coming of the Lord, there is a time of trouble for the wicked, in which there is pestilence, and plagues, and devouring fire; and that the righteous witness these plagues that are poured out upon the wicked, but are protected. The enemies of the Lord will be consumed by the devouring fire, but those who are described in *Isaiah 33:16*, will be able to dwell with everlasting burnings. Of such a one Isaiah says: "He shall dwell on high;" David says, "He shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty." While the meat is cut off because the corn is withered, and the fire hath devoured the pastures of the wilderness, "Bread shall be given him, his waters shall be sure." And while the wicked behold only a desolate wilderness he "shall behold the land that is very far off." This last reference also shows that the time of the everlasting burnings is before the coming of the Lord. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.5*

The thirty-fourth chapter of Isaiah gives the result of this time of trouble. There it is said of the earth that "The streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch" (*verse 9*); and to show that it is the same everlasting burnings that accomplishes this, *verse ten* says: "It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever." Now, to show that even this is limited in duration, and that the fire ceases to burn when that upon which it feeds is consumed, read the next chapter, especially the first two verses: "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for

them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God." *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.6*

Happy indeed will be the lot of the man who in that awful time of trouble can say of the Lord, "He is my refuge and my fortress; my God; in him will I trust." They who in this day of salvation wash their robes of character, and make them white in the blood of the Lamb, can say in that day when God stands and measures the earth, scattering the everlasting hills, and causing the perpetual hills to bow: "God is our God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed, and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof." *Psalms 46:1-3*. Who would not wish for such confidence in a time when fearfulness surprises the hypocrites? *W.SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.7*

"Sunday the First Day" The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

A new subscriber asks how we know that Sunday is the first day of the week. We would reply that we know it in just the same way that we know that the day called Saturday is the seventh day of the week. It should be remembered that the names of the days of the week are of comparatively modern origin. Anciently the days were known only by their numbers, First, Second, etc., and this numbering is still adhered to and is universally understood, although it is more common now to speak of the days by the names that have been given to them, instead of by the numbers. The Sabbath is that which marks the week. God created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested on the seventh, and he commanded man to rest on every succeeding seventh day, giving him permission to work the six intervening days. These periods of seven days are called weeks. Ever since the creation, there have been some who have kept the Sabbath according to the commandment, but for our purpose it is not necessary to go back further than the time of Christ. Christ and those who followed him kept the Sabbath according to the commandment. See *Luke 4:16; 23:56*. This was of course the seventh day. It was the same day which the Jews kept. The Jews have kept the same day from that time to this. We find them in all parts of the world, yet they are all agreed as to the observance of the Sabbath. This shows that the day which is now called Saturday is the true seventh day, the day which was observed by Christ and which is enjoined in the fourth commandment. The day which follows the seventh day is now called Sunday. Now if we turn to *Matthew 28:1*, we shall find that the day which immediately follows the seventh day Sabbath, is the first day of the week. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.8*

As further proof that there has been no change in the reckoning of the days of the week, we have the fact that Jesus rose on the first day of the week, and that, from within two or three centuries after his resurrection up to the present time, the day of Christ's resurrection has been quite generally observed in the Christian church. If you ask people why they keep Sunday, they will always tell you it is in honor of Christ's resurrection on the first day of the week. And thus the keeping of Sunday is in itself evidence that those who observe Saturday are observing the true seventh day, and are therefore obeying the commandment of the Lord. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.9*

"Churchly Iniquity" The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

"And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." *Matthew 24:12*. These words were spoken by our Lord concerning a time just before, and reaching to, his second coming. It should serve as a complete refutation of the idea that the world will be converted, and that there will be a millennium of Christian joy and peace before the coming of the Lord. This verse not only teaches that iniquity will abound, but, with the next verse, shows that the iniquity will continue even until the end. "And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Whoever is saved when the end comes, will have "endured" something; his path will not have been one of ease, but he will have "come out of great tribulation." *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.10*

The same thing is taught by the apostle in *2 Timothy 3:1-5*: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.11*

This shows that the reason why those who shall be saved when the Lord comes, will have been called upon to "endure," is because they will have passed through perilous times; and the reason why the times will be

"perilous," is "because iniquity shall abound." It also shows that this abounding iniquity will be in the professed church, for it is committed by those who have "a form of godliness." *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.12*

Now, if we read carefully *Matthew 24:12*, we shall see that the iniquity there referred to is iniquity practiced under the garb of religion. "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." The iniquity is committed by those who have love, and causes that love to decline. Surely, then, we shall have just the opposite of Christian joy and love in the world before the Lord comes; for not only is iniquity to abound, and perilous times to exist as a consequence, but this state of things is to be right in the church. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.13*

But how can it be that such crimes as those mentioned in *2 Timothy 3:1-5* can exist in the church, when they are the very ones that now characterize men of the world? Easily enough, for the church and the world will be one. All the world will belong to the church. This will not be brought about in the good old way known to Paul and Luther and the Wesleys, namely, by conversion, but by Constitutional Amendment, a plan very similar to that adopted by Constantine and Charlemagne, who brought people into "the church" by thousands. Citizenship and church membership will be one and the same thing; and this will result in bringing into "the church" all the political hacks, ward politicians, "Boodle ringers," and whoever has an itching pain for Government coin and influence, and his name is legion. The "love of many" will necessarily "wax cold" before they can lower the standard sufficiently to receive such ones into church fellowship; and contact with the same class will by no means tend to restore that which they have lost. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 38.14*

But before this state of things can be fully brought about, men must reject the truth of God, especially that which relates to the Sabbath. And because of their rejection of the truth, strong delusion will be sent upon them that they should believe a lie. *2 Thessalonians 2:10-12*. This blindness will cause them to call evil good and darkness light, so that although iniquity will be abounding, they will say that all is well, the world is converted, and the temporal millennium has come. Then, as prophesied by Isaiah, they will say, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." And then, "when they shall say, Peace and safety," then sudden destruction shall come upon them," and they shall not escape." *1 Thessalonians 5:3*. Then the Lord shall arise to shake terribly the earth, and those who have exalted themselves shall be humbled, "and they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty." May the Lord grant us grace to humble ourselves now, that in that day we may be exalted to a place at his right hand. W. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 39.1*

"A 'Non Sequitur'" The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Congregationalist* of December 23 gives a brief notice of the Bible-class which is regularly held by Dr. Meredith, in Tremont Temple, Boston, noting especially the teaching of the last International lesson of the year. In this notice we find the following: *SITI January 20, 1887, page 40.1*

"In teaching this lesson, as well as one or two others lately, Dr. Meredith has expressed the opinion that we are not living in the last days of the world, but says he expects it to continue for centuries and ages, adducing as evidence of this the immense quantity of coal and minerals of various kinds stored up in the bowels of the earth apparently for the use of mankind." *SITI January 20, 1887, page 40.2*

It is astonishing that Bible students will call such statements as this "evidence" that we are not in the last days. While we would not call Dr. Meredith a scoffer, he certainly is in the line of the fulfillment of Peter's prophecy that in the last days men shall say, "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (*2 Peter 3:2*), and thus himself furnishes evidence that we are in the last days. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 40.3*

The argument, for such we will call it by courtesy, is this: Because there is an abundance of fuel in the earth, therefore it must be consumed. It would be just as reasonable to say that because a man has enough wheat in his barn to last him ten years therefore he must of necessity live until he has consumed it all. The Doctor forgets that sometimes those things which are designed for the use of man are made the instruments of his destruction. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 40.4*

When the word was created it was a watery mass. Peter says it was "standing out of the water and in the water." *2 Peter 3:5*. By the word of the Lord the waters were gathered together unto one place and the dry land appeared. Much of this water was stored in the bowels of the earth. It was doubtless there for man's use, just as now we draw from the earth water to supply our needs. Now suppose we imagine Noah preaching that in a few years the Lord would destroy the earth. Up speaks some wise philosopher and says: "That cannot be, for there are vast quantities of water stored up in the earth for man's use, and the earth cannot be destroyed until all that water has been consumed. But the water supply can never be exhausted, and therefore the world

can never be destroyed." No doubt he would have been applauded by the people for his wisdom. Nevertheless, "the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished." 2 Peter 3:6. And the water which was stored within the earth, together with that which came from heaven, was the means by which the earth was destroyed. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 40.5*

The apostle says that those who deny the Lord's soon coming are willingly ignorant of the facts which we have just related. He says: "But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men." 2 Peter 3:7. In this we cannot fail to see that the apostle draws a comparison between the future destruction of the earth by fire, and its former destruction by water. Just as the water out of which the earth was formed, and which was stored within the earth, caused its destruction, even so now the combustible material stored within the earth, will, together with the fire that comes down from God out of heaven, cause the earth to be dissolved. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 40.6*

It is a very unsafe thing to draw conclusions from nature, contrary to the statements made in the Bible. It is true that God has abundant provision for the support of mankind on this earth for ages to come. But he has never pledged himself to support a people who are unworthy of support. When the people of the earth have forgotten him, or while professing to know him deny him by their works, he will count them as chaff fit only for the flames, and by the very things wherein they trust, he will destroy the world and them that dwell therein, and will create a new heavens and a new earth, wherein the righteous shall dwell. W. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 40.7*

"Lot's Choice" The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.
NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.
(February 6.-Genesis 13:1-12.)

Though the place of Sodom and Gomorrah was as beautiful "as the garden of the Lord," the people were so corrupt that neither earth nor Heaven could endure them but a little while longer. "The men of Sodom were wicked and sinners exceedingly before the Lord." And "pride, fullness of bread, and abundance of idleness was in her and in her daughters, neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy. And they were haughty, and committed abomination." *Ezekiel 16:49, 50.* This was the iniquity of Sodom. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 42.1*

And though Lot found the place beautiful, he found the people abominable; and his righteous soul was "vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked; for that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds." 2 Peter 2:7, 8. But "evil communications corrupt good manners." And although Lot is given by the word of God the title of "just" and "righteous," yet his family was so far influenced by the "evil communications" of those wicked people, that his wife did not escape destruction, and his daughters, though they escaped, showed themselves more thoroughly familiar with the wicked ways of Sodom than with the righteous ways of their father. "Lot's choice" was a miserable choice. Worldly prosperity is no evidence of the fear of God, but rather tends to make the naturally corrupt heart still more corrupt. Let it be the aim of all to "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, that we may all be partakers with him of the same promise in view of which he ever lived and walked." *SITI January 20, 1887, page 43.1*

"Good and Bad Angels" The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Those who accept the teachings of Spiritualism, seem to think that we are inconsistent when we say that the spirits with whom they communicate are spirits of devils. For, say they, we read of men who appeared to Abraham and to Lot, and that angels are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation, and such beings certainly cannot be spirits of devils. Of course they are not; but the angels who came to Abraham and Lot did not claim to be the spirits of their dead friends. The angels whom our heavenly Father sends to minister to those who shall be heirs of salvation, and who were sent to minister to Christ in the wilderness of temptation and in the garden, do not contradict God's word, by saying that they are the spirits of men who died, when the Bible says that the dead know not anything. They are angels of light, and angels of darkness; angels who are pure and holy as when God created them, and angels who sinned, and thus lost their first estate. But none of these angels were ever men. They were created angels, and were never of the same nature as men. How may we know the difference between the good and the bad angels? Try them by the word of God. "If they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

Isaiah 8:20. If they contradict the Bible, or in any way throw discredit upon it, know that they are of the devil, who is a liar and the father of it. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 43.2*

“Men Never Become Angels” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Little children used to be taught to sing, “I want to be an angel.” It was a vain wish, but they didn’t know any better. Man was made “a little lower than the angels.” Those who are counted worthy of a part in the first resurrection, will be made “equal unto the angels.” *Luke 20:35, 36.* They will be equal unto the angels only in that they cannot die any more. But equality does not mean identity, but the contrary. If we say that one thing is equal to another, we indicate that there are two distinct things. So when the Lord said the righteous will in the resurrection be equal unto the angels, he indicated most emphatically that they would not be angels. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 43.3*

“But,” says an objector, “Moses and Elias were seen on the mount; how do you account for their presence there if the dead are unconscious and do not become ministering angels?” Easily enough. Elias never died but was translated without seeing death. Moses died and was buried by the Lord, by whom he was afterwards raised from the dead. That he was raised is proved by two things: 1. Christ and Satan disputed about the body of Moses. *Jude 9.* Satan has the power of death (*Hebrews 2:14*), and therefore claims all the dead as his lawful prey. Christ has been through the grave, bringing with him its keys (*Revelation 1:18*), and therefore he has the power to divide the spoil with Satan. See *Isaiah 53:12*. That is, he will take from Satan those servants of Christ whom Satan has claimed as his own. So Christ took his faithful servant Moses, referring Satan to the Father, as the vindication of his right to do so. 2. The Bible plainly declares that the dead know not anything, and that their thoughts perish as soon as the breath goes forth. It further expressly states that the dead cannot converse with the living unless they are first raised from the dead. Therefore we know that when Moses appeared on the mount of transfiguration, it was not as an angel, nor as the spirit of a dead man, but as a man who had been dead and had been raised to life. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 43.4*

“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Last Sabbath, January 15, the Oakland Church had the pleasure of listening to a sermon by Elder W. P. Curtis, lately from Kansas. The discourse was based on *Matthew 16:19*, and was an outline of the fundamental principles of the doctrine of the true church of Christ, with a statement of the danger to which the church has been and is exposed, and a description of the final triumph of the faithful. On Sunday, January 16, Brother Curtis and family sailed for Australia on the steamer *Alameda*. He will stop at Honolulu a month or two, to help along the work there. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.1*

Not long ago several of the clergy of Chicago, yielding to the argument (?) that “to the pure all things are pure,” and to an invitation to of the National Opera Company, attended the performance of certain ballets that they might, as the invitation ran, “give a fair opinion as to whether the dance, as present with artistic refinement in the American Opera ballet, is not an attractive, artistic, and morally innocuous adjunct to the opera.” It is almost needless to say that no sooner had these men yielded to this operatic sophistry than they were told by the friends of the ballet that they “went there to satisfy their curiosity and see what it looked like;” that “the excuse that they desired to inform themselves that they might more forcibly condemn it, is too thin;” that they knew very well before they went what they would see, “for it is a matter of concealed, undisputed, universal knowledge. Yet they went there to see whether it was better not!” and finally, that having gone themselves they could not well object to their parishioners going. All of which should be a lesson to the clergy of Chicago. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.2*

The *Christian Standard* says of the request of the thief on the cross, “Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom” (*Luke 23:42*):-*SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.3*

“He had no doubt reference to the kingdom as it will be manifested at the second coming of Christ-the kingdom of the glorified, though he had no clear conception of its nature.” *SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.4*

Nobody can tell how clear a conception he may have had of the kingdom of Christ, but it is certain that in his request he had reference to the second coming of Christ. This truth is more clearly marked by Griesbach’s text, which reads, “Remember me in the day of thy coming.” And since Christ’s coming in his kingdom is at his second coming (*Matthew 25:31*) we see that the thief made his request intelligently. What Christ promised was simply that his desire should be fulfilled. An emphatic declaration was made to the effect that when Christ should come the second time the thief should then be with him; he should be remembered. The word “to-day” simply makes the declaration the more emphatic. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.5*

In the trial of Professor Smythe, of Andover, for heresy, Professor Baldwin, of Yale College, one of the counsel for the defense, is reported by the *Independent* as follows:-*SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.6*

"The doctrine of probation after death, Professor Baldwin maintained, has already done much, and was destined to do more, to overcome agnosticism, the most hurtful error which prevails at the present day among men."*SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.7*

An "agnostic" is one who does not believe anything, and doesn't *profess* to know anything although he really thinks that he knows more than all the world beside. Professor Baldwin says that the doctrine of probation after death has converted men from agnosticism. That is, they believe it, and therefore they can no longer be called agnostics. How convenient it is to be able to invent doctrines that will take infidelity away from men whether they will or not. Thus, the doctrine of probation after death tells the sinner that if he doesn't repent in this life, he will be all right, because another "chance" will be given him after death. This, being in accordance with his desires, is of course readily accepted. In this way the "larger hope" converts men. We submit that it is better to be an agnostic than to believe a lie; for the man who believes a lie rests satisfied with his condition and cannot be moved.*SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.8*

"The 'Larger Hope'" The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

The "larger hope" is being much talked about now. This "larger hope" is that if men do not accept Christ in this life, they will have a chance to repent after death. It is no new thing. Satan set before Eve a "larger hope" than the Lord did. He persuaded her to believe that she would be much better off if she went outside of God's command. She soon found out her mistake. The antediluvians cherished a "larger hope" than Noah did. He, poor credulous soul, thought that if he did get into the ark he wouldn't be drowned. Their hope was not so circumscribed. Their free minds took a much wider range, and they thought that they would be saved enough if they ignored the ark. But "the flood came, and destroyed them all." The men of Sodom were not so narrow in their beliefs as Lot was. He believed that his only hope lay in flight from the city. They had a "larger hope," and therefore would not put themselves to the trouble to flee. "But the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all." "Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." Those who cherish this "larger hope" will then find out their mistake. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." This hope is large enough to take in the whole creation; "for God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that *whosoever* believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." This hope is limited to this life, for when Christ comes the second time it is "without sin, unto salvation." Nevertheless, the Spirit and the bride say, Come; and *whosoever* will may take the water of life as a gift. Who could ask for any larger hope than this? Well might the apostle exclaim: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God!"*SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.9*

"How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord,
Is laid for your hope in his excellent work!
What more could he say than to you he hath said,
Who unto the Saviour for a refuge have fled?"*SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.10*

"Bible Justice Vindicated" The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

In a Spiritualist paper we find the following quotation from Pascal:-*SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.11*

"Nothing appears so revolting to reason as to say that the first man should impart guilt to those who, from their extreme distance from the source of evil, seem incapable of such a participation. This transmission seems to us not only unnatural, but unjust. For what can be more repugnant to the rules of our despicable justice than to condemn eternally an infant, yet irresponsible, for an offense in which he appears to have so little share, that was committed 6,000 years before he came into existence?"*SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.12*

Doubtless many besides Spiritualists will adopt that language as their own, and will fancy that in so doing they are bringing an unanswerable argument against the doctrines of Christianity. But everybody who has read the Bible to any purpose knows full well that it does not teach that either infants or adults are condemned for an offense committed either 6,000 years or half as many minutes before they were born. Neither is one person condemned for the offense of another, no matter when that offense is committed. The Bible plainly declares:-*SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.13*

"The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear

the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." *Ezekiel 18:20*. And the same thing was taught to the Jews in their earliest history. Thus: "The father shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin." *Deuteronomy 24:16*. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.14*

The Bible nowhere countenances the idea that one person shall suffer for the offense of another. But it does recognize the fact that a stream cannot rise higher than its source. If Adam had retained his purity, he would have begotten children with tendencies to right doing; but having fallen, his posterity must necessarily be born with tendencies to evil. This evil nature with which all men are born, is strengthened by evil practices, so that although "by one man sin came into the world," death justly passed upon all men, "for that *all have sinned*." To those who charge the Bible with partiality and injustice it may always be said: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures." *SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.15*

"The Gospel Manual" The Signs of the Times, 13, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Such is the title of an excellent little book, a copy of which we received some days ago from the author, Rev. Samuel Slocombe. As described by the title page, the book is "an arrangement of the four Gospels into one continuous record of the life and ministry of Jesus Christ, with notes and appendix." Unlike some other works of the same nature, this book does not give *all* the four Gospels; that is, where two or more of the evangelists have recorded the same thing, only the fullest account is given. But while this may be an objection to a critical student, there are no doubt many who will be pleased with the simplicity of the work. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.16*

The appendix contains some interesting thoughts on the "characteristics of the Gospels," besides "brief notes, mostly chronological," which are explanatory rather than a controversial, and are "indicative," the author says, "of the reason for adopting a particular course in the presence of conflicting views." *SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.17*

The convenient size of the book, 192 pp., five and one-half by six and one-half inches, and the price, from fifty cents to one dollar and twenty-five cents, according to binding, together with some of the features before mentioned, will no doubt make it quite popular. It can be obtained of George C. McConnell, 757 Market St., San Francisco. *SITI January 20, 1887, page 48.18*

January 27, 1887

"Things We Should Know.—No. 1." *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

As finite beings, our knowledge is necessarily limited. There are many things that it is impossible for us to know. In fact, that which we know is a very small amount in comparison with that which we do not know; and much of that which we think we know is only conjecture. People sometimes think they know a great deal about nature, but such ones only think so because of their ignorance of the vastness of God's works. Sir Isaac Newton, after a lifetime of contemplation of the works of nature, and investigation of physical phenomena, said that he was like a child playing with pebbles on the shore of the ocean, while the vast expanse was still before him unexplored. And when we come to things supernatural, our knowledge is still more limited. We can know nothing of them, except they are revealed in God's word. It is idle for us to conjecture concerning the size of the throne of God, the height of the tree of life, the width of the streets of the New Jerusalem, or of the river of water of life. These things have not been revealed to us, and hence it is not necessary that we should know them. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.1*

But there are some things which are very plainly made known, and these things it is our duty to know. If we remain ignorant of them, it is a sin. In a few articles we shall consider some of the things that we may and should know without any mixture of doubt. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.2*

In *Deuteronomy 4:30* Moses says: "Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in Heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; thee is none else." *SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.3*

This may be called the first element of knowledge, because whoever says "There is no God," is a fool. *Psalms 14:1*. A man may be ignorant of a great many things and yet not be a fool; but one who is ignorant of things existing around him, who is unconscious of the existence of the sun, the air, the blue sky, the towering mountains, or any of the works of creation, and who looks upon all with indifferent eye,—such an one we say is a fool. But that is virtually the condition one must be in if he denies the existence of God, for God is known by his works. Says the psalmist, "For all the gods of the nations are idols; but the Lord made the heavens." *Psalms 96:5*. Again, "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork." *Psalms 19:1*. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.4*

A knowledge of God is inseparably connected with a knowledge of his creative power. The psalmist says again: "Know ye that the Lord he is God; it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture." *Psalms 100:3*. This is shown still farther by the fact that the heathen lost their knowledge of God through failure to recognize his creative power. Thus Paul says that the heathen who know nothing of God are without excuse, because ever since the creation of the world the eternal power and godhead of God may be seen from the things that are made. And then he says that darkness came upon them "because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful." What would it be to glorify him as God? Evidently to properly recognize him as creator, for it is that which distinguishes him as the one true God. Thus the psalmist, after declaring the power of God above all gods, says: "Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name." *Psalms 90:8*. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.5*

But if we acknowledge God as creator, and consider it in our heart, to what will that lead? It will lead to the perfect doing of his will. Obedience is due only to superiors by inferiors. It is a principle of law that one who is dependent on another is in duty bound to obey the will of that other just to the extent that he is dependent on him. Man is dependent upon God for *everything*—in him we live, and move, and have our being;—and therefore he is in duty bound to yield obedience to the will of God in every particular. And if a man recognize this supremacy of God, and his own dependence, he will do the will of God. That obedience to God is a necessary consequence of a recognition of his supremacy, or, rather, is the only way in which his supremacy can be recognized, is shown by the following verses, one of which has already been quoted:—*SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.6*

"Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath; there is none else. Thou shalt keep therefore his statutes, and his commandments." *Deuteronomy 4:39, 40*. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.7*

The same thing is still further seen by the fact that ignorance of divine truth springs directly from disobedience. Paul says that strong delusion shall come upon men, so that they shall believe a lie, for the reason that they receive not the love of the truth. *2 Thessalonians 2:10-12*. And again he warns the people to watch lest they be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin. *Hebrews 3:13*. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.8*

It will not be denied that a knowledge of God is of the utmost importance, and that it is a primary duty; and

since we can retain our knowledge of God only by doing his will, how important it is that we keep his commandments. In obeying any precept of God we recognize his authority, and increase our knowledge of him; but there is one duty, the performance of which leads especially to the knowledge of God. In *Exodus 31:13, 17*, we read these words of the Lord:-*SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.9*

"Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you." "It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed."*SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.10*

Here the reason is given why the keeping of the Sabbath leads to a more perfect knowledge of God. The Sabbath commemorates the completed creation. The Sabbath is given for this very purpose. It can be properly kept only when we consider the wonderful power and goodness of God. In the ninety-second psalm, which is for the Sabbath day, the psalmist speaks of the necessity of praise to God, and says: "For thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work; I will triumph in the works of thy hands." *Verse 4.SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.11*

The same thing that is stated in Exodus is repeated by the Lord through the prophet Ezekiel: "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." "And hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." *Ezekiel 20:12, 20*. In these words the Lord expressly declares that the Sabbath is the only means that he has given whereby men may preserve a knowledge of him. And so when we read the command, "Know ye that the Lord he is God," it is equivalent to a command to keep the Sabbath.*SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.12*

"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." This is the day which commemorates creation. No other day calls attention to the power of God. Changing the day of rest is the first step toward complete loss of knowledge of God. When we read that the heathen became what they are because "when they knew God they glorified him not as God," and remember that the glory of God is his creative power, and that keeping the Sabbath is the means by which we recognize that power, we do not see how the conclusion can be avoided, that the first step toward the degradation revealed in *Romans 1:23-31* was the refusal to keep the Sabbath which God had sanctified.*SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.13*

The "man of sin" became such by thinking to change the times and the laws of God. The attempted change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week, is the boast of the Catholic Church. To this she points as the badge of her authority. And this fact marks the Papacy as essentially heathen. Thus: By the act of changing the Sabbath it claimed the place and authority of God. Paul says of the Papacy: "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." *2 Thessalonians 2:4*. One power can usurp the place of another only by changing, or attempting to change its laws. But if the Papacy puts itself in the place of God, showing itself to be God, it must necessarily ignore the existence of the only true God; and thus it is that by changing the Sabbath the Papacy becomes essentially heathen. It matters not that the Papacy counts for nothing unless the action corresponds. Paul says of certain ones: "They profess that they know God; but in works they deny him." *Titus 1:16.SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.14*

It is the rejection of the truth that is going to land the mass of the people of the last days in the worst kind of infidelity. See *2 Thessalonians 2:9-12*. The Sabbath of Jehovah was, so far as we have any record, the first truth revealed to man (see *Genesis 2:1-3*), and it is the primary and most essential truth, since it pre-eminently teaches the existence and power of God. It is this truth which the Papacy has sought to overthrow, thus putting itself in the place of God; it is against this truth that Satan, the arch-enemy of God, exerts all his hellish arts, that he may lure men from allegiance to God; and it is the rejection of this truth which will make men an easy prey to Satan's strong delusion, and bring them under the wrath of God.*SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.15*

Let us then keep the Sabbath of the Lord in spirit and in truth. Let us not substitute a way of our own choosing, thus exalting ourselves to the place of God. If by the faith of Christ we earnestly strive to keep the commandments of God, we shall "follow on to know the Lord;" and in the earth made new, where all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest, we shall be permitted every Sabbath (*Isaiah 66:23*) to see God and to worship before his throne, acknowledging his goodness and power, in that he hath made all things new. W.*SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.16*

"Laborers in the Vineyard" The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

A friend asks us to give an explanation of the parable of *Matthew 20:1-16*. It is the parable of the vineyard, in which the householder went out early in the morning to hire laborers for his vineyard, agreeing with them for a penny a day. Afterward he went out at the third hour, the sixth, the ninth, and the eleventh, each time finding some unemployed persons whom he set to work, agreeing to give them what was right. When the evening came he told his steward to give the laborers their hire, beginning with the last and ending with the first. To the last he gave a penny each. The others who had worked the entire day, seeing this, supposed that they should receive more, but they received just what they had been promised, a penny each. When they murmured at this, the householder said to one of them: "Friend, I do thee no wrong; didst not thou agree with me for a penny? Take that thine is, and go thy way; I will give unto this last, even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" *SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.17*

In explaining this parable all difficulty will be removed if we remember that those who were hired at the sixth, the ninth, and the eleventh hour came as soon as they were called. When the householder found men standing idle at the eleventh hour, and asked them, "Why stand ye here all the day idle?" they answered, "Because no man hath hired us." The parable, therefore, gives no countenance to the idea that men may delay the acceptance of the gospel until the last hour of their lives, and then fare as well as those who have served the Lord all of their lives. It has no reference whatever to men who have had a knowledge of the gospel but who have put off accepting it. It refers to those who have not received the light of truth until late, but who accept it as soon as they receive it. As Jesus spoke the parable, it no doubt had its specific application to the Gentiles, who had not enjoyed equal advantages with the Jews. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 54.18*

Now as to the payment. The householder made a fair bargain with those whom he had hired first, giving them good pay, as wages went then; therefore when they received a penny apiece they received all that was their due, and had no reason to complain. If the master wished to give others the same amount for half an hour's labor, he had a right to do so. Indeed, if he had wished to give money to those who had not labored at all, it would have been doing no injustice to those who had received all that they had been promised. Applying the parable to those who are called to labor for the Lord, we learn that it is not so much the amount of labor that men do as it is the readiness with which they labor, that is taken into account. God promises eternal life to all the faithful, and those who labor faithfully from the time they are called, even though they are not called until the eleventh hour, will receive the same reward as those who have labored a longer time, but with no more faithfulness. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 55.1*

"The Day of Salvation" The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

A subscriber asks, "What day is the psalmist speaking of in the twenty-fourth verse of the 118th psalm?" The text is easily answered if we consider the context, which is as follows:—*SITI January 27, 1887, page 56.1*

"Open to me the gates of righteousness' I will go into them, and I will praise the Lord; this gate of the Lord, into which the righteous shall enter. I will praise thee; for thou hast heard me, and art become my salvation. The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it." *Verses 19-24. SITI January 27, 1887, page 56.2*

The subject under consideration is salvation, for which the psalmist is praising the Lord. This appears still more clearly when we read the entire chapter. He recognizes the fact that salvation comes through Christ, by saying: "The stone which the builders refused is become the head-stone of the corner." The fact that the subject of salvation is under consideration, and that he says, "Open to me the gates of righteousness; I will go into them, and I will praise the Lord," is evidence that the psalmist is not speaking of any special literal day, but that he uses the word "day" in the sense of a period of time, as in *Proverbs 24:10; Ecclesiastes 7:14*, and other places. Just as there is no special day of the week when men may have prosperity or adversity, so there is no special day when men may enter the gates of righteousness or may seek salvation. Ever since the fall, men could enter the gates of righteousness at any time they chose. Thus it will be until probation ends. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 56.3*

And so the day spoken of here by the psalmist, is the day of salvation of which Paul speaks in *2 Corinthians 6:2*; for he says: "For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee; behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." That this is not limited to any particular day, nor even to what is called the Christian dispensation, may be seen from the fact that these words were written seven hundred years before Christ, and are quoted by Paul. See *Isaiah 49:8. SITI January 27, 1887, page 56.4*

Again, the day spoken of is the day in which the stone which the builders rejected becomes the headstone of

the corner. It is the day of salvation, that is, the whole period of time in which God's grace is manifest toward sinners, that Christ is the head of the corner, because the entire plan of salvation centers in him. Paul says to the Ephesians: "Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." *Ephesians 2:19, 20*. This shows that Christ was the corner-stone in the days of the apostles and prophets, and this is only in harmony with what Paul says in *1 Corinthians 3:11*: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." *SITI January 27, 1887, page 57.1*

Again Christ refers to the same day to which David does, in *John 8:56*, where he said of the Jews: "You father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad." Abraham saw the day of salvation, and entered into the gates of righteousness. The gospel was preached unto him (*Galatians 3:8*) and he rejoiced in it as did David. To say that *John 8:56* refers to a certain day of the week, would make nonsense of the text; but no more than it would to limit *Psalms 118:24* in like manner. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 57.2*

With the above explanation it is unnecessary to enter into an argument to show that the day to which David refers is not the first day of the week. Indeed, that has been shown already. It is not on Sunday or upon any other special day of the week alone that men can enter into the gates of righteousness and rejoice because of salvation. But "now"-that is, the present time, this period of probation-"now is the accepted time;" "now is the day of salvation;" therefore Paul says: "Rejoice in the Lord always; and again I say, Rejoice." *W.SITI January 27, 1887, page 57.3*

"Christ the Archangel" The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

In hymns and prayers and exhortations we often hear of "angels and archangels." In the Bible we find no such expression for it is not an admissible one. Archangel means the chief or head of angels. Now while there must necessarily be among the armies of Heaven many angels who are high in authority, there can be but one who is chief of all. The same people who use the term "archangels," often use the term "arch-enemy" or "arch-deceiver." In this case they have reference to Satan, the chief enemy of God and men. Knowing that Satan is the prime instigator of all evil, they do not think it necessary to specify who is meant when they say "arch-enemy." There could be but one. So there could be but one archangel. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 59.1*

The Scriptures enable us to tell with exactness who the archangel is. In *1 Thessalonians 4:16* Paul says: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first." In *John 5:26-29* we read the words of Christ. "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." Here we learn that it is the voice of the Son of God that calls the dead from their graves. The previous text says that it is the voice of the archangel; therefore, the archangel is the Son of God. Then certainly there can be but one archangel; for in all things Christ has the preeminence. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 59.2*

Again we come to the same conclusion by a comparison of *Jude 9* and *Daniel 10:21*. Jude says: "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation." In the book of Daniel (*chap. 8:16; 9:21*) we find that the angel Gabriel was commissioned to interpret the visions of the prophet. In *chapter 10:21*, before he begins a most important revelation, he says: "There is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince." Here the expression, "Michael your prince," has undoubted reference to Christ, but we have already learned (*Jude 9*) that Michael is the archangel. *Daniel 10:13* strengthens the position that Michael, the archangel, is Christ, for we there read (margin) of "Michael, the first of the chief princes." This is in harmony with what was said before, that although the armies of Heaven must have many leaders, there could be but one head over all, and that is Christ. *W.SITI January 27, 1887, page 59.3*

"Christ, Angels, and Men" The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we noted that angels and men are two different orders of beings. Man was made "a little lower than the angels." *Psalms 8:4, 5*. Paul says of Christ that "he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." *Hebrews 2:16*. This shows a difference between the nature of angels and the nature of men. But it shows also a difference between the nature of Christ and that of angels. Christ did not take the nature of angels; that statement would be uncalled for, if he already had the nature of angels. He was higher than the angels, and when he humbled himself, he came down, not to the nature of the angels, but was made a little lower than the angels, even to the level of man. *Hebrews 2:9.SITI January 27, 1887, page 59.4*

That Christ is higher than the angels, is plainly stated in *Hebrews 1:4*, where, speaking of the exalted position which the Son occupies, at "the right hand of the Majesty on high," Paul says: "Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they." "For unto which of the angels said he [God, the Father] at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?" *Verse 5*. The angels are sons of God by creation; Adam was also, but now that the race is fallen, we can become sons of God only by adoption (*Romans 8:14-16; Colossians 4:4-6*); but Christ is the Son of God by birth. He is the only begotten Son of God. He is the archangel, not because he is the highest angel, but because he, as Son of God, is head over all the angels. Jesus is the first of the creation of God (*Revelation 3:14*), not that he is the first of created beings, but in the sense that he is the head of all created things. "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist." *Colossians 1:16, 17*. *W.SITI January 27, 1887, page 59.5*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Independent* says: "It is curious that the Westminster Confession of Faith knows nothing whatever of the millennium, and provides no place for it." There is something curious in that, because it happens to be exactly the Bible position. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.1*

A lady, evidently a Spiritualist, writes in an exchange as follows, about Christianity and Buddhism: "I see nothing to prevent fusion, conciliation, and unification of the two faiths, if rightly understood." One who has that idea may be very well informed concerning Buddhism, but certainly knows nothing about Christianity. And it is altogether a mistake to call Buddhism a "faith." It is really the absence of faith. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.2*

"Much reading of German metaphysics and theology has opened windows for many a soul; but it has also opened cellar doors leading to unfathomable depths of darkness." So says the *Christian Union*. But we remember that the same fountain cannot yield both sweet water and bitter, and therefore we believe that the so-called windows of German metaphysics and theology are cellar doors leading to unfathomable depths of darkness. The simple Bible truth never leads men to darkness. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.3*

A Methodist minister in Pennsylvania caused a sensation a few days since by declaring that he did not believe in the divinity of the Bible and did not know anything about immortality or whether there is a God, and that he had finally concluded not to preach what he did not believe. It would be a good thing for the cause of genuine Christianity if all the ministers who are in the same state of doubt would be equally candid. Infidelity in the pulpit, though concealed, makes infidelity in the pew. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.4*

In the trial of the Andover professors, Professor Churchill, "in allusion to the slight connection of his chair of elocution to the theological instruction, remarked in pleasantry that he never allowed his pupils to pronounce *sheol* with a circumflex. It must always be with the *downward* and *grave* accent." There are many ministers who would have people believe that *sheol* means a place of torment, when it means simply the grave, the place of the dead. Such would do well to learn from Professor Churchill. When he gives *sheol* a *grave* accent, he is certainly orthodox. *SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.5*

Elder Jones writes from the College: "The present term may fairly be counted as the most prosperous in the history of Healdsburg College. There are now about one hundred and fifty students in attendance. The family at the Students' Home now numbers ninety-two. There are two Bible classes, one numbering sixty-six, and the other fifteen. There are also two missionary classes numbering together about the same as the largest Bible class. All in the Bible and missionary study seem to enter into it with a will. The spiritual condition of the school is quite good-in the family at the Home it is very good. The teachers and managers are all of good courage, and are thankful to the Lord for the favor which he has bestowed upon the institution." *SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.6*

Said Christ: "I am come that they might have life." *John 10:10*. To the Jews he sorrowfully said, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." *John 5:40*. These texts prove that if Christ had not come, men could not have had life; for he would not come to give men what they already had. And it proves that although Christ has come to give life those who do not come to him cannot have life. Christ said: "All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers." That is the truth to-day. All who come between men and Christ, who teach men that they may have life without accepting Christ, are thieves of the worst sort. They steal from their deluded victims their only hope of life. If the man who takes from his neighbor that upon which he depends to sustain his life shall receive sevenfold, surely the one who takes from his neighbor that upon which he depends to sustain his life shall receive sevenfold, surely the one who takes from his neighbor the Bread of eternal life

shall receive seventy and seven fold.*SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.7*

Let it be understood that life and death are exactly opposite terms. Life means existence. So long as a man has breath, he has life, no matter what his circumstances may be. He may be in poverty, or suffering the utmost agony, yet he is alive. Eternal life is simply eternal existence. The statement that the righteous are to have eternal life does not necessarily imply that they will be happy. That they will have perfect happiness is true, but it could not be learned from the simple statement that they shall have eternal life. When we are told that they shall dwell eternally in the presence of God, we know that they will have fullness of joy. But we are told by men, not by the Bible, that the wicked are to suffer eternal torment. If that were true, they also would have eternal life; for man cannot be in torment unless he is alive. The Bible tells us, however, that "he that believeth not the Son shall not see life" (*John 3:36*); and further that they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction." *2 Thessalonians 1:9*. So then he who rejects Christ does not simply reject happiness, but dooms himself to everlasting destruction, death from which there is no resurrection, "the blackness of darkness forever."*SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.8*

Sunday before last the South Street Presbyterian church, Morristown, N. J., received eight persons by letter, as follows: One from the High church "House of Prayer," Newark; one from St. Thomas Episcopal Church, New York City; one from a close communion Baptist Church; one from a Lutheran Church; two from the Church of England; and two from Congregational Churches. The *Independent* sees in this "an indication of the great advance of the lay masses who compose the Christian churches of this country, toward the obliteration of denominational lines, and a practical church union." True; and when there is this church union, and the State by its laws upholds religion, what will we have but union of Church and State?*SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.9*

"Driving to Church on Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 13, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The old question of riding to meeting on the Sabbath is up again. A good sister who thinks that people ought not to drive their horses to meeting on the Sabbath, quotes a part of *Exodus 20:10*: "Thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle;" and says, "I would ask why one part of the fourth commandment is taken up, and the other part is left out, by Seventh-day Adventists?"*SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.10*

We would reply that such is not the case, except by here and there an individual. The sister who asks the question has herself done this very thing, for she quotes the commandment as though it entirely prohibited work of any kind, both for man and beast; but this is not the case. The clause preceding the one which she quoted reads: "Six days shalt thou labor and do all *thy* work." Now in view of this part of the commandment, it is evident that when the Lord says, "But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt not do any work," he means that we shall not do any of our own work, but does not mean that we shall not do his work; for the commandment teaches that the Lord's work is to be done on that day. Christ said: "It is lawful to do well on the Sabbath day," thus showing that to do something is in accordance with the law of the Sabbath; only that which we do must not be our own work.*SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.11*

If, as is very evident, the commandment, "thou shalt not do any work," means simply that we shall not do any of our own work, then the same thing follows in regard to our son, or daughter, or cattle. They must not do any work of a purely secular nature. Now to not forsake the assembling of ourselves together for exhortation, is a divine command. But it is absolutely impossible for people to assemble together on the Sabbath day without doing some work, for it is often a good deal of work to walk two or three miles. The work necessarily involved in walking to meeting, is, therefore, allowable, for it is not for worldly profit; and, therefore, by the same rule, it is allowable for a man to drive his team to church, if he or his family are not able to walk. The Lord does not require that cattle shall keep the Sabbath more strictly than their masters.*SITI January 27, 1887, page 64.12*

February 3, 1887

“A Weighty and Timely Utterance” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

Our good friend, the editor of the *Herald of Truth* (Baptist), has shown zeal in his efforts to uphold the Sunday-Sabbath, which would be commendable if it were in a better cause. He has ransacked the coast from Washington Territory to Southern California to find men who had skill in making assertions appear to be argument, and has had several different men try their hands at building under the Sunday institution a cobweb support which would look strong and beautiful if not examined too closely. It has been of slight importance that these men have differed materially in many of their statements, since they all agreed in one thing, namely, that Sunday is the Sabbath, and this conclusion would serve to satisfy people who are already convinced. It would seem, however, that their efforts have not fully satisfied the editor of the *Herald*, for of late he has been very earnest in his endeavor to have the State Legislature enact a law compelling all people to keep Sunday. From this it appears that he has not the utmost confidence in the power of the arguments of his correspondents to substantiate the claims of Sunday. The strongest argument for Sunday, namely, the law of the land, has been reserved for the last. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.1*

We do not wonder that the editor of the *Herald* thinks it necessary to appeal to something besides theological arguments, when we read the last one that was offered before he began to work for the civil argument. It was written by one Gilbert S. Bailey, D. D., and although the editor said in regard to it, “It is not often that the *Herald of Truth* carries such a weighty and timely utterance of an honored Baptist, as in this number,” we think that on second reading he must have revised his opinion. The article, however, was thought worthy of being put in tract form for extensive circulation, and we notice it, not because it contains anything which the SIGNS has not answered again and again, but chiefly that our readers may understand just what, among California Baptists at least, is considered “a weighty and timely utterance” in behalf of Sunday. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.2*

After a paragraph of assertions, the Doctor states the following proposition, which he says he will prove: *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.3*

“The disciples of Christ commenced the religious observance of the first day of the week immediately after the resurrection of Christ, and Christ himself was present with them and gave them his sanction and blessing.” *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.4*

This proposition he considers under three heads: 1. The Scripture proof. 2. Proofs from church history. 3. Testimony of the Fathers. The first text which he quotes in proof of his proposition is *John 20:19*: “Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.” On this text the Doctor says: “Four times on this day of his resurrection he appeared to his disciples, and this last time is particularly described.” “Jesus imparted to his disciples the Holy Spirit, and gave the highest possible approval of their meeting, and appointed them as ambassadors. They were thus endowed with the Holy Spirit to guide their own conduct, and to guide them in teaching others.” *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.5*

In harmony with his statement that the disciples began the observance of the first day of the week immediately after the resurrection of Christ, the Doctor evidently means to convey the idea that the disciples were gathered together in a religious meeting in honor of Christ's resurrection. That this assumption has no foundation whatever in fact, may be seen by anyone who will take the trouble to read a few texts of Scripture. We will notice those texts which refer to the day of his resurrection. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.6*

“Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.” *Mark 16:9-11*. No comment is needed on this, and we will let the sacred historian proceed with his narrative: “After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue; neither believed they them.” *Verses 12, 13*. This appearance to the two disciples who were going into the country is described in detail in *Luke 24:13-25*. There we learn that as they were walking along the road, Jesus joined them, but they did not recognize him. They had heard the story of the women to whom Jesus had appeared earlier in the day, but did not believe that Jesus was risen. And it was not until they sat down to supper that Jesus made himself known to them. *Verse 30, 31*. This was at the close of the day. *Verse 29*. They immediately arose and returned to Jerusalem, a distance of eight miles, and found the eleven gathered together, to whom they told the experience of the day. But as we have already learned from *Mark 16:12, 13*, the eleven, did not believe them. This is made still more evident from Luke's account of the appearing of Christ to the eleven, for he says that when Jesus came into their midst and said, “Peace be unto

you," they were terrified. Jesus, noticing their terror, showed them his hands and his feet to convince them that he was a real being and the one whom they had seen crucified. And even then, although the truth was beginning to force itself upon them, "they yet believed not for joy." Here, then, we have some of the particulars concerning the meeting spoken of in *John 20:19*, and we find that instead of having a meeting to commemorate Christ's resurrection, the disciples did not believe that he had risen. Thus the first text which the Doctor quotes in support of his proposition contradicts it. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.7*

But this is not all. Mark tells what they were doing there together that evening. After having told how Jesus appeared to the two as they went into the country, and how they had told the eleven but had not been believed, he continues: "Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." *Mark 10:14*. Thus we find that instead of holding a religious meeting on the evening of that first day, they were simply eating supper, and so Christ appeared to them and asked them for something to eat, in order that he might convince them that he was not a phantom but a real being. They had food ready at hand, "and they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of a honey-comb. And he took it, and did eat before them." *Luke 24:42, 43*. Now if the reader wishes to know how the disciples happened to be together that evening, he may read *Acts 1:12, 13*, where he will find that they all lived at the same place. From the time of the last Passover until the day of Pentecost the disciples had one dwelling-place. So, then, the idea that when Jesus met with the disciples on the evening of the resurrection they were holding a religious service in honor of his resurrection, is not merely an unwarranted assumption, but is a positive contradiction of the Scriptures. This is a fair specimen of these "weighty and timely utterances" in behalf of the Sunday. The editor of the *Herald of Truth* says that his paper is not often honored with such a "weighty and timely utterance" on the Sunday question as this of Mr. Bailey's. If that is so, he has cause to congratulate himself. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.8*

But there is still another point. The Doctor quotes with great confidence the fact that Jesus said to the disciples, "Peace be unto you." He says: "Jesus imparted to his disciples his Holy Spirit and gave the highest possible approval of their meeting, and appointed them as ambassadors. They were thus endowed with the Holy Spirit to guide their own conduct and to guide them in teaching others." But what has this to do with the sanctifying of Sunday? He said, "Peace be unto *you*," and not, "Blessed is this day." He endowed the disciples with the Holy Ghost, but imparted no sacredness to the day. First-day writers are wont to lay great stress on the fact that Jesus blessed his disciples one Sunday evening, as though that imparted any sacredness to the day. If they could show an instance where the day itself was blessed, it would be more to their purpose. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.9*

Some may, however, think with Dr. Bailey, that by thus breathing on the disciples and imparting to them the Holy Spirit, he "gave the highest possible approval to their meeting;" but when they remember what we have already proved, that their meeting was simply a family gathering around the supper-table, they will hardly think that an every-day affair like that needed a special act of divine approval. If the reader will bear in mind that what Jesus said was to *his disciples*, and not *about a day*, they will be saved from jumping at a false conclusion. When Jesus said to his disciples, "Peace be unto you," it was without the slightest thought of specially sanctioning what they were doing, but because they were terrified at his appearance when they supposed that he was dead. *John 20:19* would never be quoted as an argument for the sacredness of Sunday if that institution were not in desperate straits. An unprejudiced person who did not know that the Sunday must be maintained at all hazards, would read that text a thousand times and never get the idea that it could be used as an argument for Sunday. *W. SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.10*

(To be continued.)

"The Curse of the Law" The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

A brother in the State of Minnesota asks the question, "What is the curse of the law?" and wishes an answer through the SIGNS. We could give a categorical answer in one word, and say, "Death," but this would not relieve the brother's difficulty, as he wants better authority than our unsupported word. We will therefore take a little more space and let the Bible answer. We cannot refrain, however, from expressing our astonishment that such a question should be asked, because a knowledge of what the curse of the law is almost necessarily precedes the acceptance of the gospel. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.11*

The only place where the term "curse of the law" occurs in the Bible is *Galatians 3:13*, which reads as follows: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The text itself contains the answer to the question asked. For since Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us, if we know what Christ suffered for us, we shall of course know what is the curse of the law. It is hardly necessary to quote Scripture to prove that Christ suffered death for us, yet in order to make the argument complete we will quote a few texts. Paul says

(Romans 4:25) that he "was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." Isaiah says (*chap. 53:8*), "He was taken from prison and from judgment; and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken." *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.12*

Again Paul says (*Romans 5:6-8*): "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Death, then, is what Christ endured in order to redeem us, and that this is the curse which he suffered and from which he redeemed us, is plain from the last clause of *Galatians 3:13*: "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." This refers to Christ's death by crucifixion, as Peter says in *Acts 5:30*: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree." The argument then stands thus: Men were under the curse of the law; Christ came to redeem them from this curse; in order to redeem them from this curse, he had to endure the same curse; what he endured was death; death, therefore, is the curse of the law. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 70.13*

This is a sufficient answer, but we will give further Scripture evidence to prove the same thing. Paul says in *Romans 8:7* that "the carnal mind is enmity against God," for the reason that "it is not subject to the law of God." But "to be carnally minded is death" (*verse 6*), therefore we must conclude that death follows the violation of the law; and this is only what Paul expressly declares in *Romans 6:23*: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." Now in *Deuteronomy 30:15-20*, death is expressly shown to be the curse which God pronounced against sinners. We quote *verse 19*: "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." We read also (*Romans 5:12*) that "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Thus we know that death is the curse that follows sin. But "sin is the transgression of the law" (*1 John 3:4*); therefore death is the curse for transgression of the law; or, in other words, it is the curse of the law. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 71.1*

Once more; Paul says that the doers of the law shall be justified; that is, if men never violated the law they would have the favor of God. But the favor of God is life (*Psalms 30:5*); therefore obedience to the law would secure life. Compare *Matthew 19:17*. But "all have sinned" (*Romans 3:23*), and "therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." *Romans 3:20*. This means that the law condemns everybody, since all have violated it; and since justification by the law means the favor of God and life, it follows that condemnation by the law means the wrath of God and death. And this argument is summed up in one sentence, thus: "The commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." *Romans 7:10. SITI February 3, 1887, page 71.2*

Scripture proofs on this point might be multiplied indefinitely, but we think these are sufficient to establish the almost self-evident fact that the curse of the law is death. *W. SITI February 3, 1887, page 71.3*

"Is It Peace?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

Elsewhere in this paper the reader will find articles bearing on the present war preparations in Europe. Scarcely a day passes but that some new feature is not reported. For instance, "The German army possesses a new explosive called roborite. It is reported to be stronger than melinite. The method of its manufacture is a secret. It is exploded by intense heat." Again we learn that "the Austrian war budget is to be increased twenty-five million dollars." We are also told that the Austrian Landsturm will supply one million additional men, and that the rules which have just been published show that nothing except men from the service. All agree that no such war preparations have ever before been made in Europe, even when war had been declared, whereas now there is general peace. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 71.4*

Some of the comments made by the daily papers concerning these things strike us as being decidedly strange. The *S. F. Evening Bulletin* says: *SITI February 3, 1887, page 71.5*

"Never in the history of Europe have war preparations been made on so large a scale. Yet who can say that these preparations may not tell in the interests of peace?" *SITI February 3, 1887, page 71.6*

The *Oakland Evening Tribune* says: *SITI February 3, 1887, page 71.7*

"Everything portends war. A spark may ignite the combustible material at any moment. Such preparations for war have not been known in Europe for many years; but each nation being prepared may be the very cause of preventing war." *SITI February 3, 1887, page 71.8*

We fail to see any promise of peace in preparations for war. The peaceable men of a community are not the ones who always go armed. Men do not carry weapons unless they expect to use them at some time. True, they may not have any definite hostile determination, but they go armed so that they may be "prepared" when any provocation is given. Men who never intend to fight, never carry arms.*SITI February 3, 1887, page 71.9*

So with nations. Where there are warlike preparations, there is expectation of war. The nations of Europe are not members of any peace society. They have been known to fight when they had less strength and less confidence in their strength than they have now. They are extremely jealous of one another. The increased preparation of any one nation will not frighten the others into greater desires for peace, since they all are keeping equal pace in the work of arming. These preparations mean nothing else but war. It may not come for some time; the longer it is delayed the greater will be the preparation; and when at last the spark is dropped into the magazine, there will be such a commotion on the continent of Europe as the world has never seen. It will then be demonstrated whether or not the people of the United States can, as the *Tribune* says, look complacently on and profit by the struggle. It is now almost too soon to be so positive in regard to that matter. *W. SITI February 3, 1887, page 71.10*

"The Nations Are Angry" The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

The following from the *Interior* of January 20, 1887, gives an excellent view of the condition of Europe. The word of God says that under the sounding of the seventh trumpet "the nations were angry." Assuredly this is the case now. And when the elements do break loose, with such immense armaments, and such multitudes of soldiers, what can the result be but destruction upon destruction? Whether it comes sooner or later the certainty is that it must come, and it can only be as described in *Jeremiah 25:32*, "A great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth." And yet in the presence of those things men will preach peace and safety, and the speedy coming of a glorious millennium of peace on earth!*SITI February 3, 1887, page 72.1*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we received an envelope containing two post-office money orders, and some postage-stamps, but not a line to indicate from whom the money came, nor where it should be applied. Whoever has sent money from which he has received no return, would do well to communicate with us at once. We would like to know what to do with the money.*SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.1*

Through the courtesy of J. H. Kellogg, M. D., member of the Michigan State Board of Health, we have received the thirteenth annual report of that body. It contains many interesting statistics, and directions for avoiding disease. The book also contains the report of Professor Vaughan's experiments with poisonous cheese, some extracts from which we shall give in our Health and Temperance Department.*SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.2*

We clip the following item of news from a secular paper:-*SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.3*

"The Saturday half-holiday movement promises to be stronger than ever in the East the coming summer. A bill has been introduced in the New York Legislature making the entire day Saturday a legal holiday, and there is a strong popular sentiment behind it."*SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.4*

This means the enforced observance of Sunday; for the advancement of the counterfeit sabbath is just in proportion as the Sabbath of the Lord is depreciated.*SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.5*

We learn from the report of a sermon by Rev. Dr. Stebbins, of San Francisco, that although Solomon "has been called a very wise man," he possessed wisdom only to a limited degree," but was not a wise man nor a profound man." The *learned* speaker said that Solomon "was always asking questions about everything, never seeing into anything." The declaration is in the face of the following words addressed to Solomon by the Lord: "Lo, I have given thee a wise and an understanding heart; so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee." *1 Kings 3:12*. But Solomon didn't live in the nineteenth century, and was consequently ignorant of many things that are *known* by modern "divines." However, we would rather know only a few things that are true, than to know so many things that are not so.*SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.6*

The following we clip from a secular paper published in an interior town:-*SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.7*

"The basket social given at the Christian church last evening was very well attended, and was a very pleasant

and enjoyable affair. The mating brought about by the sale of the baskets was voted a most happy thought, and created no end of fun and laughter. After the supper, a season of social entertainment was had, and at a late hour the meeting broke up, all present having had a jolly good time." *SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.8*

This was in a "Christian" church. If it were indeed a Christian church we would not greatly blame those who see no need of their becoming Christians. People can do such things as that without the trouble of making a profession of Christianity. In the days of Noah, people were doing the very same things; but they were not the ones who went into the ark. In the days that were before the flood, "they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage," no doubt having "a jolly good time," and "no end of fun and laughter," until the day that Noah entered into the ark. So absorbed were they in their fun that they "knew not until the flood came, and took them all away." And "so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." *SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.9*

The *Christian Union* makes merry over the regulations of the West Boston Bridge Corporation, a section of which stands thus: "And the said proprietors shall meet annually on the first Tuesday of June, providing the same does not fall on Sunday." Well, that does sound funny, but the lawyers who drew it up doubtless know what they were about. They had evidently read the "arguments" for Sunday-keeping, in which we are gravely informed that the first day of the week is "the eighth day," and they very naturally concluded that it must be easier for the first and the third days to be identical than for the first and the eighth, especially since there are but seven. Since the Sunday advocates have shown us how variable the days of the week are, the first day being both the seventh and the "eighth," people can't be too careful in specifying, if they want them kept separate. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.10*

On another page mention is made of the new explosive, roburite, which the Germans have discovered, and which is considered to be far more powerful than melinite, which has recently been invented by two French officers. Of course the composition of both explosives is a secret, but they are known to have terrible power. Melinite is said to have ten times the destructive power of nitro-glycerine. A shell charged with a quantity of this explosive would be capable of doing deadly work. It is also reported that while the manufacture of this material is going on, its inventors are experimenting with a new rifle powder which explodes without making any smoke, and which will enable a body of infantry to fire on the enemy from cover, without betraying their position by clouds of smoke. Science has been developed to its present state of advancement principally for the purpose of enabling armies to exterminate one another as speedily as possible. As has been remarked, "chemists are developing into wholesale slaughterers of men." *SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.11*

A religious exchange says:- *SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.12*

"Omaha has 100 saloons paying \$1,000 per year license, and that money goes into the school fund. The result is that the public schools of Omaha are as fine as any in the country." *SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.13*

What a blessing saloons are, to be sure! It is evident that if Omaha only had a few more saloons, it might have the very best public schools in the country; and since nothing is more desirable than good schools, it follows that a few more self-denying philanthropists ought to start saloons in that city. How good the honest drunkard-makers must feel to have the assurance of the religious press that they are the principal supporters of civilization and education. The journal, however, forget to note two points: (1) That in order to get that one hundred and sixty thousand dollars for the public schools, the people of Omaha and vicinity must pay the saloon-keepers not less than one million dollars, at a low estimate; and (2) that Omaha is about the hardest town in the interior of the United States. Six hundred per cent. per annum, besides hundreds of criminals and paupers, is a pretty high rate of interest to pay for money, even for educational purposes. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.14*

In recording an interview which she recently had with a lady of some note, Miss Francis Willard says: "I was glad to note her fair, unpunctured ear-a proof of wholesome instincts." Miss Willard is a woman of excellent sense. While it is true that many ladies of refinement and taste do disfigure their ears with rings and pendants, it remains a fact that the custom is borrowed from the savage races. The more barbaric a people are, the more so-called ornaments they put on. When we see a lady with unpunctured ears, we involuntarily, like Miss Willard, give her credit for good sense or else for good training. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.15*

In our notice of the "Gospel Manual," two weeks ago, we stated that "where two or more of the evangelists have recorded the same thing, only the fullest account is given." This was an error on our part. The author says: "I am not aware of a single chapter or page where this is done. My aim was to produce a book which should embody the entire contents of the four Gospels, except where two or more of the evangelists have recorded the same thing *in the same words*. Verbal differences of statement, embodying faintest shades of meaning, are all interwoven into the general narrative." This feature is certainly an important one, and greatly enhances the value of the book. We very gladly do the author the justice of correcting the error which arose from a too hasty examination on our part. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.16*

E. J. Waggoner

We have seen a good many college and school journals "edited and conducted wholly by the students," and there are a few that come to us occasionally. The most that can be said for the majority of such journals is that they serve to keep the students out of worse employment. Too often they are filled with local notes and jokes which can interest no one but the students themselves, and which have anything but an elevating effect on them. The *True Educator*, published at South Lancaster, Mass., is emphatically not one of this class. While it is published by the "Academy press," and the mechanical work is done by the students, it is edited by the principal of the Academy, Prof. C. C. Ramsey, who is making it just what it claims to be, a journal "for teachers, students, parents, and school officers." We can conscientiously say of it that it improves with every number. Professor Ramsey is one who believes that "it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing," and is untiring in his efforts to make both the Academy and the journal worthy of the patronage of all. The *True Educator* is warmly recommended by some of the best teachers in the country, because it is just what its name implies. Subscription price per year, seventy-five cents; combined with the *American Sentinel*, on dollar, the price of the latter paper alone being fifty cents. Address, *The True Educator*, South Lancaster, Mass.; or Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal. *SITI February 3, 1887, page 80.17*

February 10, 1887

"Things We Should Know.—No. 2" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

"Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou, that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment." *Ecclesiastes 11:9*. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.1*

Here is another thing we must know. The knowledge of this naturally follows from the knowledge of the existence of God. He is our Creator, and therefore has a right to claim that we shall do his will; but if this is so, it necessarily follows that judgment must be passed upon us, to see if we have done his will. The text is addressed to young men; but since God is no respecter of persons, we must conclude that all classes of people will alike be brought into judgment. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.2*

That all the world will be brought into judgment, is positively stated in the Bible. In his sermon on Mars Hill, Paul said that God "now commandeth all men every where to repent; because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." *Acts 17:30, 31*. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.3*

What shall be the standard of the final judgment? If we are to know that for certain things God will bring us into judgment, it must be that we can know what to do in order to secure a favorable decision. We have already learned that, being wholly dependent on God, we are bound to conform to his will in every particular; therefore we must conclude that God's will is to be the standard of judgment. This conclusion is supported by the words in the Lord's prayer, which indicate that when God's kingdom comes his will will be done by all. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.4*

What then is the will of God, by which we are to be judged? Paul gives the answer in the following words: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, And knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." *Romans 2:17, 18*. How was it that those whom Paul addressed knew the will of God? Because they were instructed out of the law. Then it must be that the law of God contains the will of God. This is still further shown by the words which David uttered prophetically in behalf of Christ: "Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." *Psalms 40:7, 8*. It was Christ's delight—more than his meat or drink—to do the will of God. He ever did the will of the Father. This was because the law of God was in his heart, so that all his actions were spontaneously in harmony with it. But acting in harmony with the law of God, was doing the will of God; therefore the law of God is identical with his will. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.5*

Once more: When the young man came to Jesus and asked what he should do that he might inherit eternal life, Jesus answered: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." *Matthew 19:17*. In his sermon on the mount, he said: "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." *Matthew 7:21*. Therefore keeping the commandments of God is equivalent to doing the will of God. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.6*

The law of God, then, is to be the standard by which all men shall be judged. This is incidentally shown in the passage already quoted from Romans: Thou "knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." According to the marginal reading it is, Thou "triest the things that differ, being instructed out of the law." The law of God is that by which we try things that differ, by which we decide what things are honest and just and pure and lovely and of good report, and what are not. This, we say, is incidental proof that we are to be judged by the law of God, the ten commandments; for it is manifest that we must judge our actions by the same rule by which God will judge them. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.7*

In the text quoted at the beginning of this article, Solomon tells the young man to have his own way if he will, to walk in the ways of his heart, and in the sight of his eyes, but to *know* that for "all these things" God will bring him into judgment. Then we are to know not only that there will be a judgment, but that the judgment will take into account our thoughts; for the ways of a person's heart are the ways which his heart devises or thinks upon. This is plainly stated in the next chapter: "For God shall bring ever work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." *Ecclesiastes 12:14*. This agrees with the words of Paul, that when the Lord comes he will "bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." *1 Corinthians 4:5*. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.8*

We have seen that the judgment is to be in accordance with the law of God; and since every secret thought is to be brought into judgment, it follows that the law of God takes account of even the thoughts of the heart. Read now *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14*: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter; fear God, and keep his. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Here we see that the fact that God will bring every secret thing into judgment, is given as a reason why we should keep the commandments of God. This shows again that the law is so spiritual as to detect the slightest deviation from it even in thought. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.9*

With this agree the words of Paul: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart." *Hebrews 4:12*. As showing how the law discerns the thoughts and intents of the heart, we refer to the words of Christ in *Matthew 5:18-22, 27, 28*, where we find that a single hateful thought or lustful look is accounted a violation of the sixth or the seventh commandment. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.10*

There is an intimate connection between *Ecclesiastes 11:9* and *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14*. The latter text is an exhortation to keep the commandments of God, based on the truth that by those commandments God will bring "every work into judgment, with every secret thing." The former text is an emphatic command to those who seem bent on having their own way, to *know* that "for all these things" God will bring them into judgment. And since that judgment is to be based on the commandments of God, and is to take into account every secret thought, it follows that *Ecclesiastes 11:9* is virtually a command for us to *know* that the ten commandments cover every possible deed or thought, and demand perfect obedience. It is a command for us to study the law, and to meditate in it day and night. If we are ever at a loss to know how perfect the law requires us to be, we have only to consider the life and character of Jesus. He "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." This was simply because the law was in his heart. Any one who models his life in accordance with the law of God, will be just like Christ, and the law will be satisfied with nothing less. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.11*

This righteousness cannot be attained by our own individual effort. Of ourselves we can do nothing: but Christ, who knew no sin, was made to be sin for us, in order "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." And so the command to know that God will bring us into judgment for every secret thing, includes the command not only to know that the law of God is to be the standard of that judgment, but also that through Christ alone can we attain to that perfect righteousness which the law demands. If Christ dwells in our hearts by faith, then we can exhibit in our actions the righteousness of the law, for if we have Christ in the heart we must have the law there also. And having lived thus, when we are brought before the judgment seat, and God fixes upon us his piercing gaze, he will see, not us, but the image of Christ, and because he lives we shall live also. *W. SITI February 10, 1887, page 86.12*

"Barkis Is Willin'" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

There is a movement on foot in California to secure a law exempting from taxation private and denominational schools and churches of all faiths. Dr. Stratton, of the University of the Pacific (Methodist), is doing all in his power to secure influence in favor of such a law. In pursuance of that object, he called upon the Catholic Archbishop Riordan. To his evident surprise he found that the archbishop expressed not only a willingness but a desire to co-operate with him and others in securing such legislation. We could have told him without going to inquire, that the Catholics would be in favor of having church property exempted from taxation. There are more than four times as many Catholics in California, as there are of Protestants of all denominations; and it is certainly not far out of the way to say that the Catholic Church owns at least twice as much property as do all the Protestant denominations combined. President Stratton may rest assured that he can count on Catholic co-operation in any scheme tending toward the support of the church by the State. Such a law would be a good deal in the nature of special legislation in behalf of the Catholic Church. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.1*

For our part, we have no hesitation in expressing our disapproval of such a law, leaving the Catholic Church out of the question. The church is not, or should not be, a pauper. Let Christians support the churches. It would certainly be an act of injustice to tax infidels and other non-professors, to support something in which they have no interest, or to which they are decidedly opposed. When Christianity has not enough strength to stand alone, but must lean on the State, it has not enough vitality to carry on aggressive evangelical work, and is not worth supporting. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.2*

But Dr. Stratton found out something else when he called on the archbishop. He says in a letter to the *Advocate*:—*SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.3*

"Among other subjects of conversation were the questions of temperance, and Sabbath [Sunday] observance, and he expressed a desire to co-operate with all Christian people, or others, in promoting these causes." *SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.4*

Will not a mother care for her own child? Here again we could have told Mr. Stratton that he would find the Catholic Church more than ready to co-operate with Christians, "or others." Sunday is a child of the Papacy, and professed Protestants may depend upon it that she will not disown her offspring. The Doctor's interview with the archbishop convinced him that the Catholics have been misrepresented. "The Church," is a pretty good thing after all, and will aid greatly in matters of "reform." Strange that intelligent Protestants can be so blind! But this only serves to show how professed Protestants are preparing the way for the triumph of Roman Catholic principles in this country. Meanwhile the wily prelates of the Catholic Church are chuckling over the situation. They well know that if they were to take the initiative in attempting to secure State patronage and Sunday legislation, there would be an outcry which would work disaster to their projects; but they are perfectly willing to "co-operate" with Protestants. True Protestantism, however, will never lend itself to become a catspaw for Catholicism. *W.SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.5*

"A Weighty and Timely Utterance" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

"AFTER EIGHT DAYS," PENTECOST, AND TROAS

The next "weighty utterance" that we find is the following:-*SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.6*

"We have no account of their meeting again *until a week later*, after eight days according to the Jewish reckoning. No meeting is mentioned on the old Jewish seventh day; but *on the first day of the next week*, their second Lord's day, they met again and Thomas was with them, and again he said, 'Peace be unto you.'" *SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.7*

We never before heard that Thomas said to the disciples, "Peace be unto you," and perhaps Dr. Bailey did not mean to say so; but if he had positively declared that it was Thomas instead of the Lord that said, "Peace be unto you," he would have been no further out of the way than he is in saying that the second time Jesus met with the disciples was on the first day of the week. The assurance with which he says, "We have no account of their meeting again until a week later," would lead a novice to suppose that John plainly states that it was just one week later, and that the "after eight days," which the Doctor repeats in an *"aside,"* is simply his own explanation of the Bible term. What John really says is this: "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst and said, Peace be unto you." *John 20:26*. Dr. Bailey tells us that "after eight days" is the Jewish expression for one week. It would have been more satisfactory to the inquiring reader if he had given a few examples of such use of the expression, in proof of his statement. Since he did not, we will quote a few instances of similar expressions, which will plainly show that "after eight days" does not mean just one week. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.8*

In *Hosea 6:2* we read: "After two days will he revive us; in the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight." If "after eight days" means just seven days, then "after two days" ought to mean just one day, and the prophet should have said, To-morrow he will raise us up. But the prophet evidently said just what he meant, namely, that after two days is the third day. This is the Jewish as well as the common-sense mode of reckoning, and according to it "after eight days" would be the ninth day. Therefore if we begin our count with the day on which they first met, the earliest that we can place this second meeting would be the next Monday evening. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.9*

But some one will say that the Jews were not always exact in their reckoning of time. Very true, and we will give an instance of this inexactness. In his account of the transfiguration, Marks says: "And *after six days* Jesus taketh with him Peter, and James, and John, and leadeth them up into a high mountain apart by themselves." *Mark 9:2*. Luke, in relating the same event, says "And it came to pass *about an eight days after* these saying he took Peter and John and James, and went up into a mountain to pray." *Luke 9:28*. From these two accounts we find that "after six days" may mean "about an eight days after;" therefore if it is claimed that John did not mean to express the exact time, we must admit that "after eight days" means at least about ten days after, and this would bring the meeting to the middle of the next week. But by no possible conclusion can the meeting recorded in *John 20:26* be placed earlier in the week than Monday evening. How, then, must we regard the statement which the Doctor makes immediately following, that this meeting is "*specifically mentioned as on the first day of the week.*" We are unwilling to believe that he would willfully tell an untruth in order to deceive those who might be ignorant of the exact wording of the text, and we are therefore obliged to suppose that when he wrote his article he did not look at the Bible, but simply quoted from a too treacherous

memory. Whichever way it is, it shows the desperate straits in which a man is placed when he attempts to maintain Sunday sacredness.*SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.10*

Let us now look at the text itself a moment, and see how simple the narrative is. Remember that we have already shown that the disciples had one common dwelling-place at this time. On the evening of the resurrection, Jesus had come into the room while they were eating supper, to convince them that he had actually risen. For some cause not stated, Thomas was not in when Jesus came. Although they all lived at one place, it is not to be supposed that they never stirred from the house. But after eight days (whether nine or ten or more, there is no means of knowing) they were all "within." And then Jesus appeared to them again. Whether they were eating supper at this time or not is not stated. But knowing the facts as they are stated, how foolish seems the following question: "What higher sanction could Jesus give to this meeting for worship on the first day of the week, *this change from the seventh day* to the Lord's day?" The Doctor's method of argument seems to be something like this: Assume that certain things were done at a certain time; if this assumption happens to be contrary to the Scripture, then change the assumption into an emphatic declaration, so as to make people think it must be so, even though the Bible says it is not; and then from these erroneous assumptions and declarations draw a conclusion with such an air of confidence that people will think that it must be so.*SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.11*

The next "argument" is the following:-*SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.12*

"We have no account of the disciples meeting for worship on any seventh-day Sabbath from the resurrection of Christ to the day of Pentecost, which was also *on the first day of the week*."*SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.13*

Inasmuch as the day of the week on which Pentecost came that year is not mentioned, it seems rather a lame thing from which to build an argument for Sunday sacredness. It is about equal to the argument on *John 20:26*. If the pouring out of the Spirit upon the disciples upon the day of Pentecost were intended as a sanction for Sunday observance, it certainly would not be too much to expect that something should have been said about Sunday. On the contrary, however, no hint is given as to the day of the week, and some of the ablest commentators do not pretend to know what day it was, one among whom is Dr. Hackett, a Baptist commentator; he holds that Pentecost came that year on the seventh day of the week, while there are some who hold that it fell on Monday. This shows that they are of the same opinion as Dr. Barnes, who says that it is a matter of no importance what day of the week it was. And that is exactly true. If there were any significance as to the day of the week, the day would certainly have been mentioned. We could easily show from the Scriptures that that Pentecost was on the seventh day of the week, but we shall not take the time, because it would not add a particle of strength to the Sabbath argument. Even if it were plainly stated that that wonderful outpouring of the Spirit was on the seventh day of the week, we should not think of quoting that as an argument in favor of the Sabbath. At the close of creation God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, and no subsequent act could add to the sacredness there put upon it.*SITI February 10, 1887, page 87.14*

And here we will say that even if the statements which Dr. Bailey has made concerning meetings for worship on the first day of the week were true, they lack the essential element to make them of any force in favor of the Sunday; namely, a Bible statement that any sacredness was ever imparted to Sunday. If the mere being together on a certain day were proof of the sacredness of that day, then we would have, according to *John 20:26*, either Monday, or Tuesday, or Wednesday as a sacred day, for it was on one of these days, we do not know which, that Jesus met with his disciples the week after the resurrection. The day of the ascension of Christ, forty days after his resurrection (see *Acts 1:3*), was on Thursday, and on that day the disciples all met together with Jesus, and he blessed them, and they worshiped him. See *Luke 24:50-52*. If Dr. Bailey has any confidence in his method of argument, he ought to keep Thursday. The fact that he does not keep Thursday as sacred, even though Jesus met with and blessed his disciples on that day, shows that he does not really believe that Christ's meeting with and blessing his disciples on the evening of the resurrection imparted any sacredness to that day. Yet that is all the argument he has in favor of Sunday. So far as the Bible is concerned, there is just as much authority for keeping Thursday as there is for keeping Sunday. The Doctor continues:-*SITI February 10, 1887, page 88.1*

"Was this new order of Sabbaths or *meetings on the first day of the week* kept up by the apostles and by the churches which they established under the guidance of the Holy Spirit? They bade the churches 'not to forsake the assembling of themselves together.' On what day did they meet to break bread, and worship? When Paul was at Troas, where a Christian church had been previously formed, we are told in *Acts 20:7*: 'And upon the *first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread*, Paul preached unto them, and continued his speech until midnight.' Here again is specifically recorded their customs of assembling on the *first day of the week*, led by an inspired apostle. Were they right or wrong in this?"*SITI February 10, 1887, page 88.2*

Notice how adroitly everything is turned in behalf of the Sunday. The apostle says to the Hebrews: "Let us

consider one another to provoke unto love and good works; not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together;" and behold, it is quoted as an argument for Sunday! Because he tells the disciples to meet together for exhortation, it is taken for granted that he must mean for them to meet on Sunday. We are a little surprised that the Doctor did not say that we are here specifically commanded to meet on the first day of the week. We have heard *Hebrews 10:25* quoted thus: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together on the first day of the week." Dr. Bailey here neglected a rare opportunity to make another "weighty utterance" in behalf of Sunday.*SITI February 10, 1887, page 88.3*

But now what about this meeting at Troas? The apostle and his companions had been with the church there an entire week. *Acts 20:6*. If anyone thinks that Paul spent seven days with the church in Troas, and did not hold a meeting until just before he started away, he has read the life of Paul to little purpose. If Paul did not hold a meeting every day he was there, he did differently from his ordinary custom. See *Acts 19:8-10*. We have, however, the record of only one meeting with the church at Troas, and when did that take place? The record says, "On the first day of the week." But on what part of the first day of the week was it? It was in the night, because they had "many lights," and it is plainly stated that the meeting lasted all night. But according to Scripture reckoning, the day begins and ends at sunset. See *John 1:5, 8, 13, etc.*; *Deuteronomy 16:6*; *Leviticus 23:32*. The first day of the week, then, begins at sunset Saturday evening, and ends at sunset of the following evening. Therefore a night meeting on the first day of the week must be held on Saturday evening, and that is just when the meeting was held which is recorded in *Acts 20:7-11*. Then having held this meeting in the night of the first day of the week, what did Paul do in the day-time? Luke tells that he departed when it was light, and traveled on foot to Assos. That this is the view that must necessarily be taken even by Sunday-keepers, when they are not specially set to uphold that institution at all hazards, will be seen by the following extract from Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul:*SITI February 10, 1887, page 88.4*

"The labors of the early days of the week that was spent at Troas are not related to us, but concerning the last day we have a narrative which enters into details with all the minuteness of one of the gospel histories. It was the evening which succeeded the Jewish Sabbath. On Sunday morning the vessel was about to sail. The Christians of Troas were gathered together at this solemn time to celebrate that feast of love which the last commandment of Christ has enjoined on all his followers."-*Chap. 20, par. 9.SITI February 10, 1887, page 88.5*

After describing the meeting, the departure of the ship with Paul's companions, and Paul's departure on foot, the same writers says:-*SITI February 10, 1887, page 88.6*

"Strength and peace were surely sought and obtained by the apostle from the Redeemer as he pursued his lonely road that Sunday afternoon in spring among the oak woods and the streams of Ida."-*Par. 11.SITI February 10, 1887, page 88.7*

So much for Paul's sanction for Sunday worship. Perhaps, however, some may insist that the meeting was held in the night following Sunday, and that Paul's journey was on Monday; then according to their assumption that Paul tarried there a week in order to be with them at their regular time of meeting, they must necessarily claim that he passed over the whole of the first day of the week without having any meeting, and did not meet with them until the setting of the sun and the gathering darkness showed that the first day had passed. Whichever way they fix it, the record of this meeting gives no aid or comfort to the advocates of Sunday observance.*SITI February 10, 1887, page 88.8*

Now one word about apostolic example, for that is the stronghold of Sunday advocates. If apostolic example has to be followed at all, it must be followed closely. It will not do to discriminate and say that we must follow certain apostolic practices, but may neglect others. Therefore our friends who are such sticklers for apostolic example, must hold their meetings in the dark part of the first day of the week, and never in the day-time on Sunday, for the entire Bible contains no account of a religious meeting on Sunday in the day-time. And the meeting at Troas is the only recorded instance of a meeting on the first day of the week, even in the night.*W.SITI February 10, 1887, page 88.9*

"Holiness of Angels" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

When Christ spoke of the condition of the righteous after the resurrection he said, "Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels." *Luke 20:36*. Thus the angels in Heaven are immortal. But there is another feature in which the saints will resemble the angels, and that is in their holiness. This quality is a characteristic of the angels. This is so well known that an angel is almost a symbol of purity. When they are mentioned in the Bible the adjective "holy" is often applied to them. The servants of Cornelius told Peter that their master had been "warned from God by an holy angel." *Acts 10:22*. In *Matthew 25:31* Christ himself applied the term to all the angels of Heaven. He said: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all

the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." Without these direct statements as to their character, we would know that they are holy, for Christ says of these "ministering spirits," they "do always behold the face of my Father which is in Heaven." *Matthew 18:10*. And only the pure and holy in heart can see God. *Matthew 5:8; Hebrews 12:14. SITI February 10, 1887, page 90.1*

In what does the holiness of the angels consist? What is it that makes them holy? It must be in that they do the will of God. That the will of God is done in Heaven, is evident from *Matthew 6:10*; and since there are none in Heaven except the angels who do the will of God, it is a necessary consequence that they are the ones to whom Christ refers. God is holy, and the doing of his will would make one like him, holy. From *Romans 2:17, 18* we learn that God's law is his will; and that this is the will which the angels perform, and which constitutes their holiness, is plainly stated in *Psalms 103:20*: "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word." The perfection of the angels, then, is due to the fact that they keep the perfect law of God. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 90.2*

Christ taught his disciples to pray, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven." *Matthew 6:10*. This shows that a time will come when the commandments of God will be kept on earth even as the angels now keep them in Heaven. This will be in the new earth, wherein righteousness shall dwell. *2 Peter 3:13*. But although the change of the earth from old to new will be quickly effected, and although man's change from mortal to immortal will be brought about in the twinkling of an eye, the change to holiness is a gradual work. "Heaven is not reached at a single bound." The work of sanctification is a progressive work. Therefore the fact that the commandments of God will some day be kept by men on earth even as they now are by the angels in Heaven, shows that they who hope to be among the equals of the angels must now be keeping the commandments of God. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 90.3*

EVIL ANGELS

We read in *2 Peter 2:4* that "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." This shows conclusively that the angels were once on probation as Adam was in the garden of Eden, and that those who are now called the holy angels have had their characters tested, so that they are now placed beyond the reach of temptation. It shows also that the angels who sinned can have no hope of a restoration to the favor of God. Peter says that God "delivered them into *chains of darkness*." We can understand what this means by comparing a few texts. From *2 Peter 2:19*; *Fal. 3:22, 23*; *Romans 7:14* we learn that sin is bondage. The person who is in the darkness of error is in a state of bondage. Moreover, we learn from *2 Thessalonians 2:9-12* that those who persist in rejecting light will finally be given up to believe a lie. The same thing is taught in *Romans 1:28*. That is, those who persistently sin in the face of great light, will finally be left in the bondage of sin without hope of escape. This is what is doubtless meant by the angels that sinned being delivered into chains of darkness. They had light and knowledge greater than man had, as they were a higher order of creatures than he was. In the face of this light, and in defiance of the love and mercy of God, they deliberately chose the way of darkness. Having once chosen the bondage of sin, their choice was irrevocable. They were in "chains of darkness" that could not be broken. And so until the Judgment day ends their miserable careers, they are in darkness. They are darkness itself. Darkness and error are inseparable from them. Wherever they are, their presence contaminates; and their sole aim is to perpetrate lying wonders which shall lure men away from the truth into the same chains of darkness with themselves. Let us never forget to pray, "Deliver us from evil." *SITI February 10, 1887, page 90.4*

CARE OF GOOD ANGELS FOR MEN

But if "the rulers of the darkness of this world" are actively engaged in trying to overthrow us, and drag us down to eternal ruin, we have the assurance that "angels that excel in strength" are "ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." *Hebrews 1:14*. Every "little one," every child of God, has one for his especial guardian. *Matthew 18:10; Acts 12:15*. Not only so, but all the heavenly host are intensely interested in the whole human race, and anxious for the conversion of each sinner. Says Christ: "I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." *Luke 15:10*. When Jesus was born in Bethlehehem of Judea, there was joy in Heaven. It was not sufficient to send a single angel to announce his birth, but a multitude of the heavenly host must accompany him to sing their joy at the good tidings which should be to all people. So great was the joy among the angels over the fact that fallen man's Redeemer had actually come, that it would seem that they could not remain quiet in Heaven. They must flock to witness the joy of the humble shepherds, and to proclaim their own. *SITI February 10, 1887, page 90.5*

Seeing then that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (*John 3:16*); that "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (*Romans 5:8*); that Christ is at the right hand of God making

intercession for us (*Romans 8:34*); and that all the holy and mighty angels of God are interested and loving messengers of light and strength to those who are striving against sin, may we not even in the face of Satan's hosts say: "In all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." *Romans 8:37-39*. W.SITI February 10, 1887, page 91.1

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

Last Wednesday, February 2, Brother W. I. H. Baker and Sister Josie Baker sailed on the steamer *Australia* for Honolulu, whence, after a stay of ten days, they will sail on the *Mariposa* for Australia. Brother and Sister Baker have been faithful laborers in the office of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, and we shall miss them both here and in the Sabbath-school. Many prayers and good wishes will follow them on their journey, and to their new field of labor. SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.1

The *American Sentinel* for 1886, bound either in paper or I cloth, can now be furnished in any quantity. In either style it is very convenient for carrying, and can thus be used for reference by ministers who are traveling from place to place. Nowhere else can so many facts and arguments be found on the vital subject of "National Reform." No one who wishes to be intelligent in regard to this matter should fail to procure a bound volume of the *Sentinel*. Price, in paper, sixty cents; in cloth, one dollar. Address *American Sentinel*, Oakland Cal. SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.2

An Eastern paper says: "The Jews are talking of changing their Sabbath to our Sabbath, beginning with the year 1900." We do not see how this thing can be done; the Jews might easily abandon the ancient Sabbath and go to keeping another day; but to change "their Sabbath"-by which we suppose is meant the seventh day, "the Sabbath of the Lord"-to "our Sabbath"-which, we take it, means Sunday-is just as impossible as to change Monday to Thursday, or 12 o'clock noon to 12 o'clock midnight. God has spoken, and said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath," and though "hand join in hand," and both Jew and Papist think to change the times and laws of the Most High, all his commandments will still be sure, they will stand fast forever and ever. SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.3

The *World's Advanced Thought* thus patronizingly notices the progress of a prominent "divine":-SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.4

"The *Christian Union*, called by the Rev. Lyman Abbott, repudiates the doctrine of the resurrection of the body as 'inconsistent with Scripture, antagonistic to science, and a product of a Pagan and materialistic habit of thought.' If the Reverend Abbott would get hold of a file of the paper edited by Andrew Jackson Davis twenty-five or thirty years ago, he could pick up a good many such views that were held by the last generation of spiritual Spiritualists, and that the spiritual Spiritualists of the present consider too well established to be live subjects for discussion." SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.5

It must be encouraging to "the leaders of Christian thought" to be assured by the very "spiritual Spiritualists" that they are making advancement in the spiritualness of Spiritualism. SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.6

It is stated that there were 3,247 arrests for gambling in Los Angeles last year, but that only twenty-two of the arrests were of white men. The others we suppose were Chinamen. It is touching to see the tender regard which the California policeman has for the morals of the benighted brethren who are among us. No one supposes for a moment that the number of Chinese gamblers exceeds the number of white men who indulge in the same vice; and the only reason we can give why the police do not arrest the white man as well as the Chinamen, is that they think the former were beyond reformation. Heathenism is not dependent on race or color, and we very much doubt if the Asiatic heathen could give any information in vice to those who are of American or European birth. SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.7

When Peter speaks of the manner in which the prophecies were given, he says: "But there were false prophets also among the people." Wherever you find anything of value, you will find a counterfeit. Those false prophets arose for the purpose of bringing the true prophets into disrepute. In like manner we might expect that when prophecies are interpreted by the word of God, there will be false and absurd interpretations, calculated to make sensible people disgusted, so that they will resolve to have nothing to do with any interpretations of prophecy. There are some professed Adventist journals which persist in setting a time for the coming of the Lord, although the Lord said, "But of that day and hour knoweth no man." They have been at this work for years, and have set no less than a score of different times for the Lord to come. In order to make their computation seem to be correct, they manufacture history without any regard to fact. The time now fixed by these pseudo-Adventists is 1889. We earnestly protest against such tampering with prophecy and

history; its effect is only to cause people to disbelieve that the Lord is coming at all. It is enough for us to know that the coming of the Lord is near, "even at the doors." We are not required to understand the things which God has not revealed.*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.8*

The Papal Consistory has been postponed till the early part of March, when the new foreign cardinals will receive their hats.*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.9*

"No Sunday Law for California" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

The readers of the SIGNS will remember the account that was given of a Sunday Law mass-meeting in San Francisco several weeks ago, and of the vigorous efforts that were being made by the clergy of California to induce this Legislature to enact a rigid Sunday Law. Petitions have been circulated in all parts of the State, and several have been presented to the Assembly. A few days ago an effort was made to create a boom by means of a mass-meeting in the Assembly Chamber, which was granted for the purpose. But although the meeting was presided over by the Speaker of the House, and eloquently addressed by several clergymen and one member of the Legislature, it did not seem to have the desired effect on the members generally. On Friday, February 4, the Committee on Public Morals reported back a petition in favor of a Sunday Law, with the recommendation that the Speaker appoint a committee of one to prepare and introduce a bill in accordance with the petition. The House refused to take the action recommended. It said that there were only four votes in favor of it. This settles the Sunday Law question for this session of the Legislature. We are glad that there is in our Legislature so clear a sense of justice and a perception of the fitness of things. We earnestly pray that the Legislators of other States where the Sunday conflict is raging, may be gifted with equal good sense. California has at present a Sunday law amply sufficient to meet the demands of good order; it is insufficient only to meet the demands of bigotry.*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.10*

"The Great Strike in New York" The Signs of the Times, 13, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

This is getting to be a good deal more than a local affair, and is assuming proportions that entitle it to more than the space of a news item. A dispatch of February 4 says:-*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.11*

"The only hope the strikers have of success is to so hamper business as to bring about a settlement by arbitration. There are now on the strike nearly 49,000 men, with perhaps half that number out of work through the stoppage of business incident to the strike."*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.12*

Another dispatch of same date says:-*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.13*

"The Country General Committee of the United Labor party adopted the following resolution last night:*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.14*

"That is, in the opinion of those now conducting the strike, it becomes necessary to call out on the strike, men of other branches of industry affiliated with our party, we recommend they obey the summons, even to the point of stopping all the wheels of industry, and in time they may learn how necessary to society producing workers are."*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.15*

Still another says:-*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.16*

"The White Star steamship *Republic* and the Cunard Line steamship *City of Chicago* scheduled to sail to-day with the transatlantic mails, will not be able to get off because of the strike."*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.17*

Another dispatch of February 5 says:-*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.18*

"The calkers and joiners at work repairing the *Chyandotte*, the steamer that was damaged by the explosion of an infernal machine, struck. They had no grievances, but struck out of sympathy with the freight-handlers. Their places will be filled to-day by non-union men. The coopers employed along the piers, with the mill-wrights, joined the strike to-day. The painters and mechanics on the *Union* Line also struck. The Italians who took the place of the strikers at the Hudson River depot quit work in the afternoon."*SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.19*

We are workingmen ourselves, and we have a strong sympathy for them when they are oppressed. But we cannot sympathize with them in lawless acts even when they are oppressed, and much less when they have no grievance. Those who first struck may have had a grievance; but for all other workmen to join them, and to

deliberately plan to stop all industries, is simply barbarous selfishness. Thousands of poor people will suffer from cold and hunger because of this strike. We insist that there is no monopoly in this country so regardless of the rights of the poor as are the Labor Unions. This is emphatically an age when men are "lovers of their own selves." *SITI February 10, 1887, page 96.20*

February 17, 1887

"Human Law Against Divine Law" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Standard* having been asked what the duty of an elder of a church is with a member who stays away from church service during the busy part of the year, and spends the "Lord's day" in labor, the editor of the *Standard* replies as follows:-*SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.1*

"The course of the brother referred to is in direct violation of the law of the land, and is, therefore, directly opposed to the teaching of the Scriptures, which insist that Christians shall be law-abiding citizens."*SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.2*

It seems to us that that is a roundabout way of answering the question. Why could not the editor of the *Standard* have come direct to the point, and given the commandment which the brother was violating by laboring on Sunday? The reason is obvious; because there is no such commandment. If we were asked what should be done with a church-member who persisted in laboring upon the Sabbath, the answer would be to deprive him of church fellowship; and the reason for such action would be that he had violated the fourth commandment, which forbids secular labor on the seventh day of the week. But it is impossible to name any scripture which a man violates by working on Sunday, and therefore such an one can be accused only of violating the law of the land.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.3*

Could anything more clearly show that the Sunday-sabbath is wholly a man-made institution, having nothing but human authority to support it? We could not frame an argument that would show the utter worthlessness of Sunday more clearly than does this admission by one of its advocates; for the reader may rest assured that if the editor of the *Standard* had known of any divine law against Sunday labor, he would have quoted it without delay. The Sunday-sabbath has no sanction in the Scriptures, and therefore is not binding on anybody.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.4*

It is said, however, that the law of the land forbids Sunday labor, and that the Bible commands us to obey the laws of the land, thus sanctioning Sunday rest. The Bible does nothing of the kind. Paul says that every one should must be subject to "the higher powers," because they are ordained of God; but by that very statement he recognizes a power still above the "higher powers," and that is God, the highest power. All men owe allegiance to this highest power, and if the "higher powers" are unmindful of their duty, that does not absolve us from our allegiance to God. If they make laws which contravene the laws of God, then the Bible tells us that "we ought to obey God rather than men." *Acts 5:29*. Now the law of the land, forbidding labor on Sunday, is in direct opposition to the law of God, which says: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." *Exodus 20:8-10*. Therefore we are bound to disobey any human law requiring us to regard Sunday as a sacred day. We cannot, even by implication, admit that Sunday has any claims to reverence.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.5*

Some years ago there was a law in the United States to the effect that if a slave left his master, and escaped to a State where slavery was not allowed, anybody finding him should return him to the one who professed to own him. Any man who would refuse to send a fugitive slave back into bondage, was liable to heavy penalties. We do not know how the editor of the *Standard* regarded that law, but we do know that many men who plead for Sunday observance on the same ground that he does, namely, that it is required by the law of the land, utterly refused to be bound by the Fugitive Slave Law. Christian men despised the law, and deliberately violated it. And they were justified in so doing. Why? Because slavery is an accursed thing, and because the Fugitive Slave Law was in direct violation of the command of God, which says: "Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee; he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him." *Deuteronomy 23:15, 16*.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.6*

It is a maxim, even in human law, that if the human law is contrary to the divine law, the subject is in duty bound to break that law. No human law can claim a moment's consideration when it conflicts with the law of God. We venture the assertion that if Congress should enact a law requiring men to take the name of God in vain, the editor of the *Standard* would not only ignore that law, but would use all his eloquence to persuade others to trample upon it. If he would not obey the law of the land, when it is in opposition to the third commandment, why should he plead for it when it is in opposition to the fourth?*SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.7*

Let the reader not forget that one of the ablest and staunchest advocates of Sunday has plainly admitted that there is no divine command for Sunday observance. And he is not the only one who has made such an

admission. Remember also that there is a most emphatic commandment of the Lord, enjoining the observance of the seventh day of the week, and setting apart the other six days, Sunday among the rest, for labor. Then let him decide whether he ought to obey God rather than men. *W.SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.8*

"Infant Baptism—An Explanation" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

"In the SIGNS OF THE TIMES of January 6, there is an article over Brother R. F. Cottrell's name header 'One Error Leads to Another,' in which is quoted an extract from a Methodist minister's discourse upon baptism, and Brother C. says: 'It is hard to see how the Baptists can answer this argument while they hold to the change of the Sabbath.' Does Brother C. believe in infant baptism, or that baptism came in the room of circumcision? A TRUTH SEEKER." *SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.9*

To both these questions we can answer, No. Brother Cottrell does not believe in infant baptism, nor that baptism takes the place of circumcision. Neither of these things is believed by any writer for the SIGNS. In the article referred to he means that he does not see how the Baptists can from their own standpoint answer the argument of the Methodist minister. Thus: It is stated that the New Testament nowhere expressly enjoins the observance of Sunday, improperly called "the Christian Sabbath," and this is true. It is also a truth that the New Testament, and the Old too, for that matter, says nothing about infant baptism, neither does the New Testament intimate that baptism takes the place of circumcision. Baptists reject so-called infant baptism because it is not commanded, yet they keep Sunday, which also is not commanded, now if they persist in the observance of Sunday without any divine command therefore, it is evident that they cannot consistently repudiate infant baptism on the ground that it is not commanded. This is an instance of *argumentum ad hominem*. The writer does not mean to intimate that it is right to baptize infants, but to show how inconsistent those are who reject that ceremony because it is not commanded, and accept another ordinance which is equally unfounded. Baptists are right in their position upon baptism; if in all things they were consistent with this, they would keep the Sabbath. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.10*

There is just one text in the Bible which is sometimes referred to as showing that baptism takes the place of circumcision, although it gives no color whatever to that idea. It is *Colossians 2:10-12*, which reads thus: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." The very reading of it shows that baptism is not the circumcision referred to, because it says, "Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands," and baptism cannot be administered without hands. This circumcision made without hands is the "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," and is the same as the circumcision of the heart, spoken of in *Romans 2:29*. It is the spiritual observance of the commandments, which is accomplished only in Christ, see *Romans 8:3, 4; 2 Corinthians 5:21*. The putting off of the sins of the flesh is the same as the crucifixion of the old man, that the body of sin might be destroyed (*Romans 6:6*), or the becoming dead to the law by the body of Christ (*Romans 7:4*), and is properly followed by burial with Christ in baptism, as is indicated in *Colossians 2:10-12*. *W.SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.11*

"My Lord Delayeth His Coming" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

"True, our Lord delayed his coming, but as a thief suddenly he is coming to many every day, and to all he will finally come at such an hour as we think not." This quotation isn't from the Bible, but from a denominational newspaper. As we read it, we could not help thinking how blind so many professed Christians are upon the simple subject of the coming of the Lord. It will be noticed that the writer of the above takes it for granted that the Lord is coming. How did he learn that truth? Evidently from the Bible. But how could he learn it from the Bible that the Lord is coming, without learning some of the particulars concerning his coming? That is a mystery. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.12*

Is the Lord "coming to many every day"? The Scriptures are silent about the many comings. Christ said, "I will come *again*," which means only once more; and Paul plainly declares that he will come "the *second time*." Since Christ is to come only the second time, it is evident that he is not coming to many every day. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.13*

Another evidence that the Lord is not coming to many every day, is that when he comes everybody will know it. Said Jesus, "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." *Matthew 24:27*. "A fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very

tempestuous round about him." *Psalm 50:3*. When he comes, he will possess the throne of his glory, and will come in all the glory of the Father. *Matthew 25:31; 16:27*. So great will be the glory that it cannot be hid from the eyes of any; so the apostle John says: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him." *Revelation 1:7*.SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.14

The extract which we quoted to begin with, implies that Christ comes at the death of individuals. This idea is overthrown by the Scriptures which we have quoted, but we have direct testimony as to how Jesus will come for his saints. Paul said to the Thessalonians that he would not have them in ignorance concerning their dead friends, and gave them some words of comfort. Did he say, "Christ has come and taken your friends to be with him." No; he said, "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which *sleep in Jesus* will God bring with him [that is from the dead].... For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." *1 Thessalonians 4:14-17*. Thus we find that when the Lord comes he will take all his saints at once and not simply one at a time, and there will be a sound that will not only be heard by all who are upon the earth, but which will penetrate the graves and awake the dead.SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.15

It has been eighteen hundred years since our Saviour's first advent, but that is no evidence that his second coming is delayed. If a man tells us that he will come to see us at a certain time some distance in the future, we cannot accuse him of delaying his coming until the set time has passed. Christ did not set any time for his coming, but he gave certain signs, as the darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars, which should show it to be near. After rehearsing these signs, he said of his coming, "When ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors." *Matthew 24:33*. And then he added: "Verily I say unto you, This generation [i.e., the generation which should witness these signs] shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." So long as any are alive who witnessed these things, there is no reason to say that the Lord delayeth his coming; and Christ's promise that he will come before the generation passes away, cannot fail.SITI February 17, 1887, page 102.16

It is true that the signs which the Saviour gave to mark the nearness of his coming, are long in the past. But we are not therefore justified in saying, "My Lord delayeth his coming." None but the evil servant says that, even in his heart. *Matthew 24:48-51*. True it is that that servant the Lord will come "in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder." Surely this should serve as a warning against any servant saying that our Lord does delay his coming.SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.1

The fact that the signs of Christ's coming have been fulfilled, should lead us to say, not that our Lord delays his coming, but that it must be very near. If we take this position, and watch, we need not be taken unawares. Said Christ: "And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares." *Luke 21:34*. Paul said: "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief." *1 Thessalonians 5:4*. "Therefore let us not sleep, as do others; but let us watch and be sober." W.SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.2

"2 Peter 3:10" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

A brother beyond the mountains asks concerning this text, "Does it state that the earth as well as the works is to be burned up? Why is *also* omitted in the Revised Version? May it not be made plain from other scriptures that the earth will not be totally destroyed?"SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.3

We think that "also" is correctly omitted in the Revised Version. The Scriptures are very plain upon the point that the earth will not be totally destroyed. On *verse 11* Clarke says:-SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.4

"All these things shall be dissolved. They will be *separated*, all *decomposed*; but none of them *destroyed*. And as they are the original matter out of which God formed the terraqueous globe, consequently they may enter again into the *composition* of a new system."SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.5

And Barnes, on *verse 10*, says:-SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.6

"So far as the action of fire is concerned, the *form* of the earth may pass away, and its aspect be changed; but, unless the direct power which created it interpose to annihilate it, the *matter* which now composes it will still be in existence.... The word rendered *burned up*, like the word just before used and rendered *fervent heat*-a word of the same origin, but here *intensive*-means that they will undergo such a change as fire will produce;

not, necessarily, that the matter composing them will be annihilated." *SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.7*

You will be interested and no doubt instructed by reading a sermon by Wesley on this subject. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.8*

A few texts of Scripture will place the matter beyond all doubt. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.9*

The Saviour said (*Matthew 5:5*), "The meek shall inherit the earth." *Psalms 37* says the same thing and adds, "Their inheritance shall be forever." Man would never have lost the earth if he had not sinned. By sin the earth is defiled and corrupted; but Paul says of our inheritance that it has been purchased and is waiting for redemption. *Ephesians 1:14*. This can refer only to the earth. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.10*

We may conclude from the words of Peter that the new earth will bear the same relation to the "earth which now is," that this bears to the earth which was before the flood. There can be no doubt then, when the "fountains of the great deep were all broken up," and the "windows of heaven were opened," that the face of nature was so changed that everything looked new and strange to Noah. And so will it be when the fire has passed upon the earth, melting the elements and turning the "into a lake of fire;" when it comes forth beautified and free from every sign of the curse, well may it be called "a new earth." The most important point is that we heed the admonition of the apostles in *verses 11-14* of this chapter. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.11*

"A Weighty and Timely Utterance." (Continued.) The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

The next statement that is made is the following:- *SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.12*

"Sometimes they made collections for the poor. What day did Paul request them to attend to that? Was it the seventh day, the Jewish Sabbath? No; Paul said (*1 Corinthians 16:2*): 'Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.' Why should the first day of the week be designated instead of any other, unless it was a special day set apart for religious purposes?" *SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.13*

Like many other Sunday advocates, Dr. Bailey needs only to find the words "first day of the week" in a text, in order to have an argument for Sunday. No matter what the subject of the text is, if it contains the expression, "first day of the week," that seems to be sufficient to convince them that Sunday is the Sabbath. On this text we have this to say: Paul did not tell them to attend to the business on the seventh day of the week, because it involved work which should not be done upon the Sabbath. The poor saints in Jerusalem needed help, and Paul had taken upon himself the work of securing contributions from the Gentile converts. See *Galatians 2:9, 10*. And now in pursuance of this duty, he writes to the brethren in Corinth, directing them to each one by himself lay by in store a certain amount, according as he had been prospered. The amount to be laid by could only be determined by a consideration of the business of the preceding week, so that he might know what his profits had been. There is no more similarity between what he directed them to do and the modern church collection, than there is between daylight and darkness. That these contributions were not taken to the church and there placed in the contribution box, is shown by what Paul wrote to these same brethren in his second epistle a year later. We quote:- *SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.14*

"For as touching the ministering to the saints, it is superfluous for me to write to you; for I know the forwardness of your mind, for which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago; and your zeal hath provoked very many. Yet have I sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be in vain in this behalf; that, as I said, ye may be ready; lest haply if they of Macedonia come with me, and find you unprepared, we (that we say not, ye) should be ashamed in this same confident boasting. Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren, that they would go before unto you, and make up before hand your bounty, whereof ye had notice before, that the same might be ready, as a matter of bounty, and not as of covetousness." *2 Corinthians 9:1-5*. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.15*

Note the expressions in the above. Paul had boasted of the forwardness of the Corinthian brethren, and had thereby stirred up many to contribute liberally. Some of these liberal brethren of Macedonia were going with Paul to Jerusalem, and he feared that he might possibly arrive in Corinth and find the Corinthian brethren unprepared with their donation. In that case, both he and they would be put to shame before the Macedonian brethren. To guard against this possibility, he sent some of the brethren ahead to gather up the individual contributions, so that everything might be ready when he should come. This text is of itself sufficient refutation of the assumption that in *1 Corinthians 16:2* Paul directed the brethren to make a collection in church on the

first day of the week.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.16*

In further proof that these weekly contributions were not to be made in church, we cite the words of the text itself: "Let every one of you lay *by him* in store." Whoever can see in this a direction to put money in the church contribution box, might naturally be supposed to find in the first clause of the fourth commandment a direction to keep the first day. The man who drops his penny into the box or plate which the deacon passes before him in church, puts his money *away from him*, and not *by him*. The following translations of this clause will be sufficient to convince anybody that the contributions were not to be made in church:-*SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.17*

"Greenfield, in his Lexicon, translates the Greek term, 'by one's self, *i.e.*, at home.' Two Latin versions, the Vulgate and that of Castellio, render it, '*apud soi*,' with one's self, at home. Three French translations, those of Martir, Osterwald, and De Sacy, '*chuz soi*,' at his own house, at home. The German of Luther, '*bci such scffrest*,' by himself at home. The Dutch, '*by hemslven*,' same as the German. The Italian of Diodati, '*appresso di se*,' in his own presence at home. The Spanish of Felipe Sico, '*en su cusa*,' in his own house. The Portuguese of Ferreira, '*para isso*,' with himself. The Swedish, '*nuce sig sief*,' near himself. I know not how much the list of authorities might be swelled; for I have not examined one translation that differs from those quoted above."-*J. W. Morton, Former Missionary of the Reformed Presbyterian ChurchSITI February 17, 1887, page 103.18*

The next "argument" from Scripture is the following:-*SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.19*

"In writing to the Colossians, Paul says (*Colossians 2:16*); 'Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath day.' ... This letter to the Colossians was written by Paul thirty years after Christ's death and resurrection. Thus we see that the customs of the disciples and apostles had been kept up, of meeting on the first day of the week."*SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.20*

Here again the Doctor has evidently quoted from memory; for in the text the last expression is plural instead of singular, thus, "of the Sabbath days," and not "of the Sabbath day." How from this text he finds his conclusion that "the customs of the disciples and apostles had been kept up, of meeting on the first day of the week," is entirely beyond our comprehension; for the text makes no mention of the first day of the week. Let us see what the text really means. We quote it together with the seventeenth verse, which the Doctor found it convenient to omit:-*SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.21*

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."*SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.22*

Here we have holy days, new moons, and the Sabbath days, which are shadows of things in the work of Christ. This shows that Paul has reference to the ceremonial ordinances which were introduced after the fall and the promise of the Messiah. The twenty-third chapter of Leviticus contains a record of the appointment of these Sabbath days. It will be noticed that they are all connected with meats and drinks (see *verse 37*); and, further, that they are entirely distinct from the Sabbath of the Lord (*verse 38*). In the Sabbath of the Lord, the seventh day of the week, there is nothing shadowy, which prefigures Christ, because it was given in Eden when man was first created, and when there was no need of a sacrifice being made. In the text in Colossians Paul has not the slightest reference to the Sabbath of the Lord. In the preceding verse he has stated that the law of types and shadows had been nailed to the cross; since it consisted only of shadows, it necessarily ceased when the substance came; and therefore Paul says that no one need be judged for the performance or nonperformance of its provisions. To show that this conclusion is not a new idea of our own we quote the following:-*SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.23*

"The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the handwriting of ordinances, which had been taken away, viz., the distinction of meats and drinks, what was clean and what unclean, according to the law; and the necessity of observing certain holidays or festivals; such as the new moons, and particular Sabbaths, or those which should be observed with more than ordinary solemnity; all these had been taken out of the way, and nailed to the cross, and were no longer of moral obligation. There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere the 'remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,' is a command of perpetual obligation, and can never be superseded but by the final termination of time."-*Clarke, on Colossians 2:16.SITI February 17, 1887, page 103.24*

"The word Sabbath in the Old Testament is applied not only to the seventh day, but to all the days of holy rest that were observed by the Hebrews, and particularly to the beginning and close of their great festivals. There is, doubtless, reference to those days in this place, as the word is used in the plural number, and the apostle does not refer particularly to *the* Sabbath properly so called. There is no evidence, from this passage, that he

would teach that there was no obligation to observe *any* holy time, for there is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to declare that one of the ten commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number-*the Sabbath*-it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to affirm that that commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not on the *moral* law, or the ten commandments. No part of the moral law-no one of the ten commandments-could be spoken of as "*a shadow of good things to come.*" These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation."-*Barnes's Notes on Colossians 2:16*.SITI February 17, 1887, page 104.1

The Doctor's "Scripture proof" of the proposition that Sunday is the Christian Sabbath, closes with the following:-SITI February 17, 1887, page 104.2

"In the closing book of the divine record, sixty years after the resurrection, the apostle John, who had leaned on Jesus's breast at the supper, exclaims, 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' *Revelation 1:10*. He held it in precious observance; and the Spirit, which was given so abundantly at Pentecost on the seventh Lord's day, comes again to John sixty years later so richly that he says: 'I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day.' Thus not only the Christians at Jerusalem, but at Troas, Corinth, Colosse, and John in Patmos, places many hundred miles apart, are keeping the Lord's day, the first day of the week, as the Christians' day of religious worship, or the Christians' Sabbath. The order of things, as we have seen, was sanctioned by Christ and the Holy Spirit immediately after the resurrection of Christ, and established by the inspired apostles wherever they preached the gospel. I have now presented the scriptural proofs of these facts."SITI February 17, 1887, page 104.3

What does *Revelation 1:10* prove? Simply this: that John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day. The "reasoning" which allows that text to be used as a proof of Sunday sacredness is unworthy of a child. The apostle uses the term "Lord's day," and straightway grave doctors of divinity will assume that he must necessarily mean Sunday. And what is the ground of this assumption? Simply this: that a few hundred years after the days of the apostles, men began to call Sunday the Lord's day, and that custom has obtained quite general sanction in the Christian church. Now because men at the present day call Sunday the Lord's day, they assume that John must have done the same. Thus they interpret the Bible according to their own ideas and practices, instead of regulating their ideas and practices by the Bible. A more pernicious method of using the Bible cannot be conceived. It is by this sort of reasoning that the Catholic Church upholds the worship of images and all of its other abominations; and from that church professed Protestants have borrowed it in order to uphold the Papal institution of Sunday. Throughout the New Testament we find no sacred title applied to the first day of the week. It is nowhere called the Sabbath, and nowhere is it said to be the Lord's day or a holy day. It is simply called the first day of the week. If we could find one text stating that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, that would be sufficient, and we might then conclude that the apostle had reference to Sunday in *Revelation 1:10*; but in that case we should never hear our Sunday friends quote this latter text in favor of Sunday; they would most assuredly take the text which contained the proof.SITI February 17, 1887, page 104.4

But is it possible for us to know what day is referred to in *Revelation 1:10*? Certainly. The fourth commandment says: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." *Exodus 20:10*. The Lord, through the prophet Isaiah, expressly mentions the Sabbath as his day, thus: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day." *Isaiah 58:13*. And Jesus, when the Jews had falsely accused him of breaking the Sabbath, said: "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." *Mark 2:28*. These texts prove most emphatically that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, the day which the Jews observed,-the seventh day of the week,-is the Lord's day. No other day of the week is entitled to that appellation.SITI February 17, 1887, page 104.5

We have now examined all the Scripture evidence that can be brought to bear in favor of Sunday as the Sabbath. And what have we found? No argument whatever, but evidence to show that the seventh day of the week is the Sabbath. But suppose we had found that the disciples had held religious meetings on Sunday; suppose it were true that the meeting on the evening of Christ's resurrection was a religious service, and that the gathering "after eight days" could be shown to have fallen within the compass of a week of seven days, and that it also was a religious meeting, what would be lacking to couple this argument in favor of Sunday sacredness? The essential element of proof would be lacking. No matter if we might have found the disciples meeting every first day, we could not call it the Sabbath unless the Bible called it so. Without a Bible statement authorizing the change, no man has a right to suppose that any change has been made. Those who would regard Sunday as the Sabbath, might learn a lesson from Balaam of old, who said: "If Balak would give me is house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord my God, to do less or more." *Numbers 22:18*. W.SITI February 17, 1887, page 104.6

"Immortality of Angels" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

In place of the regular Sabbath-school which would be commented upon this week, we occupy the space in answering the following questions concerning the angels. Since the ministration of angels is the subject of the present series of lessons, these notes will not be devoid of interest to the Sabbath-school scholars, as side lights. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 107.1*

"Do the angels now have immortality? If they do, how are we to understand *1 Timothy 6:15, 16*, where it is stated that God only has immortality? This text is often used to prove that no part of man is immortal; why does it not prove the same with reference to the angels, or even of Christ himself?" *SITI February 17, 1887, page 107.2*

Immortality is unending existence; it is exemption from death. Christ says of those who shall gain the world to come, that they cannot die any more, because they shall be equal unto the angels. *Luke 20:35, 36*. This indicates plainly that the angels cannot die, and that they are therefore immortal. And yet it is a truth that God only has immortality. This seeming paradox is explained by *John 5:26, 27*, where we read: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." God has "life in himself;" he is immortal by nature. He not only has life for himself, but he has life to bestow upon others. "The gift of God is eternal life." *SITI February 17, 1887, page 107.3*

It is in this sense that God only has immortality. He is self-existent, and his existence is self-perpetuating. He is the source of all life. "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." The angels, when they were created, were placed upon probation. Some of them sinned, and "kept not their first estate," and they are kept "in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day," when they will utterly perish. Others remained loyal to God, and are now confirmed in immortality. But they, just as will be the case with the redeemed saints, depend upon God, the source of life, for their immortality, and they have no power to confer immortality upon others. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 107.4*

The case of Christ is different. He is the only begotten Son of God. As such he not only possesses immortality, but he possesses the power to confer immortality upon others. Thus we read: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." *John 5:26*. And again: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will." *Verse 21*. This life which Christ has in himself, and which he can bestow upon others, was not given to him after a successful probation, for Christ was never placed on probation, as created beings are. He was by inheritance a more exalted name and station than even the angels. *Hebrews 1:3, 4*. All that he has, is his by inheritance; immortality, and the power of bestowing it upon others, is his by virtue of his being the Son of God. *SITI February 17, 1887, page 107.5*

This statement concerning Christ does not at all militate against the statement that God only hath immortality; for Christ is God. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." *John 1:1*. Whatever attributes belong to the Father, belong also to the Son. When we read that "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," we must understand the term "God" as including both the Father and the Son, for without the Word "was not anything made that was made." And so the Father "hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father which hath sent him." *John 5:22, 23. SITI February 17, 1887, page 107.6*

"Is there any Scripture authority for speaking of Gabriel's trump as the one that shall raise the dead?" *SITI February 17, 1887, page 107.7*

None whatever. The angel Gabriel is on high in position in the courts of Heaven, as we learn from the mention of him. He was commissioned to make it known to Daniel the interpretation of his visions. See *Daniel 8:16; 9:20-22*. He was also sent to foretell the birth of John the Baptist, when his words "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God" (*Luke 1:19*), seem to imply a more intimate relation to God than that of ordinary angels. From *Revelation 22:6* we conclude that the work of revealing secrets to the prophets is intrusted to one certain angel. The angel who showed John the wonders recorded in Revelation, said, "I am thy fellow servant, and [the fellow-servant] of thy brethren the prophets." Then Gabriel was the one who talked with John. This view is strengthened by *Revelation 1:1*, where we learn that Christ saw a ... angel to convey his messages. Thus: "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he [Christ] sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John." *SITI February 17, 1887, page 107.8*

But it is the voice of the Archangel that shall raise the dead (*1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17*), and the name of the Archangel is Michael. *Jude 9*. Michael, the Archangel, is none other than Christ, for it is the voice of the Son of

God that causes those who are in their graves to come forth. *John 5:28, 29*. The trumpet that sounds is the "trump of God." Only once in the history of the world has that trumpet sounded, and that was when the Archangel, the Son of God, spoke the ten commandments from Mount Sinai. Then the earth quaked. When it sounds at the last day, not only does the earth quake, but heaven also. *W.SITI February 17, 1887, page 107.9*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

"With what day of the year in the Roman (or common) calendar does the tenth day of the seventh month of the Jewish calendar correspond? Is it the 22nd of October? If so, please explain. "W. T. H."*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.1*

There is no fixed day of the Roman calendar which corresponds to the tenth day of the seventh Jewish month. This is due to the fact that, like our months, Jewish months differ in length, and that every second or third year an extra month is inserted, so that some years have thirteen months. Last year the tenth day of the seventh month of the Jewish calendar came on October 10; this year it will come on September 28.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.2*

In a recent murder trial in San Francisco, the jury disagreed, ten of the jurymen voting for acquittal. One of the two who held out for the punishment of the criminal, quoted from the Bible in support of his opinion, and the papers are making a great ado about it. One paper says that the dissenting juror, in reply to a question, said that he believed that the sun stood still at the command of Joshua, "and that, as stated in the Bible, the sun went round the earth, and that the earth is flat." The newspapers furnish us with a great amount of information about the Bible, which we could never find out by the Bible itself. The man who can find the statement in the Bible, that the sun ever "went" around the earth, or that the earth is flat, will be entitled to a hearing through the columns of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.3*

"Is it right for Seventh-day Adventists to join themselves to the Good Templar Lodge? Does the Bible approve of it? A. R."*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.4*

No; it is not right for Seventh-day Adventists, or anybody else professing to be Christian, to join any secret society. There is nothing in the Bible to justify secret societies, but much to condemn them. Said Christ, "In secret have I said nothing." The church is the recognized body of Christ, and to it is intrusted all reforms. It is the only true benevolent society in existence. It is only when the church loses sight of its legitimate work here on earth that its members join secret societies. Moreover, secret societies are incompatible with true freedom; for whoever pledges himself to something of which he is ignorant, becomes a voluntary slave.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.5*

The *Christian at Work* has settled the question of communion wine. It is confident that unfermented wine ought never to be used, because it claims that unfermented wine is not wine at all. But then it doesn't think the wine should be strong; if it has anything fermented about it, that is sufficient. Its reason for this is the extraordinary *discovery* that the wine with which our Saviour celebrated the Supper with his disciples, was "a light claret mixed one-half with water"! It beats all how much more some people know than what is written. And now, since the Bible says nothing about wine of any kind at the institution of the Lord's Supper, but simply mentions "the cup," and "the fruit of the vine," will the *Christian at Work* or some other wise body please tell us what kind of a vine produces "a light claret mixed one-half with water"? The only "fruit of the vine" of which we have any knowledge, is grapes, and the unfermented juice thereof.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.6*

A subscriber asks if question 2 of the Sabbath-school lesson in SIGNS of January 20, entitled, "Who the Angels Are," is answered correctly. We answer, No; angels are not mentioned in any of the following books of the Bible: Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Ruth, Ezekiel, Nehemiah, Esther, Proverbs, Solomon's Son, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Malachi, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Timothy, Titus, James, and 1, 2, and 3 John. We printed the lesson that week as it was sent to us, without giving it careful examination as we ought. We have not yet got beyond making mistakes ourselves, nor overlooking them in copy furnished by others, but we aim to be correct, and are anxious to make amends when our attention is called to a blunder.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.7*

This mistake, however, does not detract from the truth intended to be taught by the lesson. If angels were mentioned only once in the Bible, their existence would be as fully proved as if they were mentioned on every page. Every statement made by Inspiration is true; and truth cannot be made more true by repetition.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.8*

Sunday morning February 13, the brigantine *Tahiti* arrived in San Francisco, thirty days from Tahiti, bringing home Brother J. I. Tay, who has been absent on a missionary tour in some of the islands of the Pacific since

the first of last July. He is in good health, and reports a most prosperous trip. We hope to be able to give some items from him next week's SIGNS.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.9*

"Sunday in Massachusetts" The Signs of the Times, 13, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

The Judiciary Committee of the Boston Common Council, to whom was referred an order for the mayor to petition the Legislature for such modifications of the Massachusetts Sunday law as may be necessary, have reported, and the report, together with the full text of the proposed new act, is printed in the Boston *Herald* of January 28. From the report it seems that the Sunday law of Massachusetts is the same now as when enacted in 1672, except that compulsory church attendance ceased in 1836. The committee say that inasmuch as this law was framed before there was a single city in the State, whereas more than half of the present population is in cities, and inasmuch as the introduction of steamboats, railroads, and other modern inventions has materially changed the habits of the people, the time has come for such a revision of the law as shall recognize existing facts. They say that it is not true that there has been any desire to appropriate any portion of Sunday to the purposes of business, but that while labor organizations demand the reservation of Sunday as a day of rest from toil, there is an equal demand for a cessation of unreasonable and superstitious restrictions. They also claim that the radical difference between town and country life prevents the possibility of any one single law being equally applicable to both.*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.10*

Speaking of those who observe the seventh day of the week, the report says:-*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.11*

"Nearly all of these persons are Israelites, but the great majority are shop-keepers, and are thereby debarred from earning their living on Sunday, after giving up Saturday as a matter of principle. This large class of our citizens, one which is noted for its sobriety, economy, and respect to our laws, is increasing in number daily, and is entitled to some special legislation. It is a curious anomaly that when the Puritans reestablished the Jewish Sabbath in practice [that is, with respect to the strictness of observance], they selected another day of the week, without any Scriptural warrant therefore. The result is that they especially punish the Israelites, who alone have perpetuated and believed in the real Sabbath of the Old Testament."*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.12*

They also enunciate the following truth, which, in the zeal for rigid Sunday laws, is being quite generally forgotten:-*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.13*

"If it be true that mankind is entitled to one day of rest in every week, it is no less true that mankind is entitled to six days of lawful work in every seven."*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.14*

In harmony with the above principle, the proposed act provides that,*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.15*

"Any person belonging to any recognized religious sect, who conscientiously and habitually refrains from work on Saturday, may carry on any secular trade or business on Sunday, within his own house, shop, or working place; provided that he does not thereby annoy any religious assembly during their hours of worship."*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.16*

There are some other features which we shall notice at another time. We shall await with interest the action of the Massachusetts Legislature on this proposed amendment to the Sunday law of that State. While it grants to Sabbath-keepers the right to quietly labor on Sunday, it guards the day in a very strict manner. It is simply a proposal to make, in a law which is itself unwarranted, a single concession in behalf of justice. If it should be rejected, it will indicate a degree of bigotry which will show that this is anything but an "enlightened age."*SITI February 17, 1887, page 112.17*

February 24, 1887

“Concealed Infidelity” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

“The gentle Nazarene did not die to become an atonement for the sins of a fallen world, but to set an example to mankind of fidelity to principle, even unto death. His pure life and noble teachings speak to the soul now as never before.” *SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.1*

The above we find in an editorial in the *Golden Gate*. We would like to ask how the writer found out that there was such a person as the “gentle Nazarene;” how he knows that his life was pure and his teachings noble; and where he learned about his death. The answer must be, in the New Testament; for nowhere else do we find any account of Jesus of Nazareth. There are in one or two profane histories, references to Jesus; but if the Bible had never been written, the world would have no knowledge of the life, character, and teachings of Christ. Whoever, therefore, accepts the truth that there was once a person on earth whose name was Jesus, and that his life was the perfection of purity, and his teachings the perfection of wisdom, must do so solely on the authority of the Bible. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.2*

But the same book which gives the history of Christ, tells us the manner and object of his death. Peter says (*Acts 2:23*) that he was taken and by wicked hands crucified and slain; and he says also, that he “his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness.” *1 Peter 2:24*. We read also that righteousness shall be imputed to us, “if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification.” *Romans 4:24, 25*. We read again, that “God commendeth his love toward us in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” *Romans 5:8*. Again we read that we are justified “through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.” *Romans 3:24, 25*. The same book which tells about the life of Jesus says, “But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” *Isaiah 53:5, 6*. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.3*

These statements concerning the death of Christ might be multiplied indefinitely. They teach plainly that Christ did die as an atonement for sin, and that those who believe in him may be justified from sin. The same book which tells about the noble character and pure teachings of Christ, gives the above reasons for his death. If we accept the first, we cannot reject the other. The one who denies the atonement of Christ, convicts himself of inconsistency when he professes to believe that Jesus lived and taught. The historical narrative includes the death of Christ as well as his life. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.4*

Moreover, Jesus himself said: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.” *John 3:16, 17*. Now the man who says that the teachings of Jesus were pure and noble, and yet says that he did not die for the sins of the world, stultifies himself, for he virtually asserts that Jesus taught that which is not true. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.5*

Our object in noticing this statement from the *Golden Gate* is to expose a sort of infidelity that is becoming very common. It is a concealed infidelity, with which Spiritualists expect to entrap many professed Protestant Christians. They refer to the historical narrative of the Bible as though they accepted it fully, and thus gain the confidence of the unwary. Having thus concealed their hatred of the Bible, they proceed to undermine faith in it by perverting its teachings. The infidel who denies the Bible as a whole, rejecting even its historical statements, is not half so dangerous as one who professes a portion of it in order that he may more easily undermine its principles. It is simply an aggravated case of Judas betraying his Lord with a kiss. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.6*

It is not Spiritualists alone, however, who do this sort of thing. There are thousands who call themselves Christians, who segregate the Bible, calling this or that portion uninspired and throwing it overboard, if it runs counter to their preconceived opinions or perverse practices. If everyone who makes a profession of Christianity, should awake some morning and find the Bible or Bibles in his possession a perfect blank, with the exception of those portions which he really believed, there would be few whole Bibles in existence, and the supply of blank paper would largely exceed the demand. *W. SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.7*

“A Weighty and Timely Utterance” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 8.

We now come to the examination of "proofs from church history." Under this head Dr. Bailey begins thus:-*SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.8*

"Mosheim, one of the most reliable of church historians, and chancellor of the University of Gottingen from 1747 to 1775, in Vol. I, p. 45, says: 'All Christians were unanimous in setting apart the *first day of the week* on which the triumphant Saviour arose from the dead, for the solemn celebration of public worship. This pious custom, which was derived from the example of the church of Jerusalem, was founded upon the *express appointment of the apostles*, who consecrated that day to the same sacred purpose, and was observed universally throughout the Christian churches as appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers.'" *SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.9*

In Murdock's Mosheim (book 1, cent. 1, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 40, we find a statement somewhat similar to the one which Dr. Bailey credits to Mosheim, but it is not expressed in nearly so strong language. We presume the Doctor quoted from Maclaine's translation, which is well known to be a paraphrase of Mosheim, rather than a translation. But we will accept the quotation just as it is given to us, for it is of no importance anyway. According to the quotation given, Mosheim states that the observance of the first day of the week was founded "upon the express appointment of the apostles." Now where did he learn this? Did Mosheim have access to some writings of the apostles that we have not? Is it true that we have only a fragment of the Bible, and that somewhere there are inspired writings hidden away, which no one but Dr. Mosheim has been privileged to see? If there are such documents, and if Mosheim found in them an "express appointment of the apostles," fixing the first day of the week as the Sabbath, it seems as though he might have had the goodness to give less favored mortals the exact words of that "express appointment." But we have never heard of any Protestant so bold as to claim that there are in existence inspired writings of the apostles, other than those contained in the New Testament. Now if the apostles did expressly appoint the first day of the week as the Sabbath, that appointment may be read by everybody. Why, then, did not Dr. Bailey quote direct from the apostles, instead of saying that Mosheim says so? Simply because the apostles never made any such appointment. If they had, the reader may rest assured that Dr. Bailey would have given it in his "Scripture proofs." *SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.10*

Right here it will be worth while to remind the reader that the apostles were not law givers. They had no authority to appoint a Sabbath day. All that they were commissioned to do was to declare the words of Christ. See *Matthew 28:19, 20*. But even Mosheim does not profess to make the statement credited to him, on the authority of the apostles. He states that it "appears from the united testimonies of the most credible writers," that this example was derived from the appointment of the apostles. We accept Mosheim as a standard church historian, but when he tells us what the apostles did, he is on ground where the most unlearned can judge of the truth of what he says. Although he was a very learned man, there is not a child fourteen years of age who may not be just as well informed as to what the apostles said and did as he was. Mr. Bailey's argument from history is simply this: He says that the apostles kept Sunday, and appointed its observance. We ask him what authority he has for such a statement, and he says that Dr. Mosheim says so, and Dr. Mosheim says, "The most credible writers" say so. There is altogether too much "they say" about this. We should prefer to hear the apostles themselves speak. They are "the most credible writers" of whom we have any knowledge. Since the custom of the early church has been stated, we might cite a few instances from history. In note 4 of the section before referred to, Mosheim says: "Perhaps also Good Friday, the Friday on which our Saviour died, was from the earliest times regarded with more respect than other days of the week." Again he says:-*SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.11*

"The Christians assembled for the worship of God in private dwelling-houses, in caves, and in the places where the dead were buried. They met on the first day of the week, and here and there on the seventh day, which was the Jewish Sabbath. Most of them likewise held sacred the fourth and sixth, the former being the day on which our Saviour was betrayed, and the latter on which he was crucified."-*Book 1, cent. 2, part 2, chap. 4, sec. 3.**SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.12*

We hope that our friends who observe the first day of the week on the authority of Dr. Mosheim, will show their consistency by keeping also Wednesday and Friday.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.13*

Two or three quotations are also made from Neander, but as they are to the same effect, simply telling what certain professed Christians did, we will not stop to repeat them. We are not so much interested in what some people may have done, as we are in what the Bible commands us to do. Even the best intentioned people do not always do what they ought to do. In *Galatians 2:12, 13*, we find that even the apostles Barnabas and Peter were at one time guilty of dissimulation, but we do not therefore conclude that we ought to do the same.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.14*

Before leaving this part of the subject we will, however, give one of Mr. Bailey's quotations from Neander with

his comments thereon:-*SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.15*

"Again Neander says: 'Those churches however which were composed of Jewish Christians, though they admitted with the rest the festival of Sunday, yet retained also that of the Sabbath; and it was from these that the custom became general in the Eastern churches of distinguishing this day as well as Sunday.' That is, the custom of keeping the seventh day as well as the first, arose from these Judaizing Christians. Do we want to follow their example in direct opposition to inspired teaching?"*SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.16*

This quotation shows that Christians in the early days observed the seventh day of the week, and Mosheim in the same paragraph from which a quotation has already been made, says that for doing this "*the other Christians taxed them with no wrong.*" This proves positively that those in early church who observed the first day of the week did not do so because of any apostolic appointment, and that they did not know of any such appointment; for if they had, they would have taxed those who did not follow it with doing wrong. These facts prove what Dr. Scott says in his comment on *Acts 20:7*:-*SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.17*

"The change from the seventh to the first day of the week appears to have been gradually and silently introduced, by example rather than by express precept."*SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.18*

Mr. Bailey says: "The custom of keeping the seventh day as well as the first arose from these Judaizing Christians. Do we want to follow their example in direct opposition to inspired teaching?" We say most emphatically, No, to both sentences. We do not want to follow the example of anybody, in direct opposition to inspired teaching. And we say also that the custom of keeping the seventh day did not arise from "Judaizing Christians," but from the commandment of Jehovah, who said in thunder tones from Mount Sinai: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." We would that some people's professed fear of acting contrary to inspired teaching had more sincerity in it. All of the ten commandments were given to the Jews, who differed no more from the heathen around them in that they kept the seventh day, than they did in that they abstained from blasphemy and theft. Those who refuse to keep the Sabbath, lest they be like the Jews, can be consistent only by rejecting the entire Decalogue. W.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 118.19*

(To be continued.)

"Is It Strange?" **The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time since, a religious writer of considerable prominence, in commenting upon the resurrection of Dorcas, said:-*SITI February 24, 1887, page 119.1*

"Imagine Dorcas's surprise when she first opened her eyes. Here she was back in the world again. How strange it is to discover that no one of those persons who were raised from the dead ever attempted to tell the story of what they saw or heard."*SITI February 24, 1887, page 119.2*

The grave is spoken of as that "undiscovered country, from whose bourn no traveler returns;" but as a matter of fact many have returned, yet none have ever opened their lips to relate what they heard or saw while dead. Now if the dead are conscious, this is passing strange. If it be true that death is simply the separation of the soul from the body, which has acted as a clog to it, restricting its free exercise, why is it that in those instances where the soul has been returned to its lodgment, no note is made of the wonderful things learned while it was permitted to expand unrestrained?*SITI February 24, 1887, page 119.3*

We say that it is indeed wonderful that no revelations have been made of what is beyond, if, as the poet says, death is only transition, and the soul is more acutely conscious in death than it ever was during life; but we do not bring forward the fact that no such revelation has been made, as proof that the dead are not conscious. We have proof of a more satisfactory nature, which clears the subject of all doubt, and explains why those who have been raised from the dead were silent as to what took place during their absence from among the living. The testimony is abundant, but we have space here for only following:-*SITI February 24, 1887, page 119.4*

Those who are dead are asleep: "Consider and hear me, O Lord my God; lighten mine eyes, lest I *sleep the sleep of death.*" *Psalms 13:3.* "It is in vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows; for so he giveth his beloved *sleep.*" *Psalms 127:2.* "And many of them that *sleep* in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." *Daniel 12:2.* "In their heat I will make them feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and *sleep a perpetual sleep,* and not wake, saith the Lord." *Jeremiah 51:30.* "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen *asleep* in Christ are

perished." *1 Corinthians 15:16-18*. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are *asleep*." "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which *sleep* in Jesus will God bring with him." *1 Thessalonians 4:13, 14*. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 119.5*

People who are in a sound sleep are entirely unconscious of what is going on, and the Bible says that the dead are unconscious: "For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything." "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." *Ecclesiastes 9:5, 10*. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." *Psalms 146:3, 4*. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 119.6*

Many more texts might be added but these are sufficient for our purpose. They are direct statements of fact, and need no explanation. There are only two things that can be done with them: Either accept them as literally true, or reject them altogether. But if we accept the Bible as the infallible word of God, we are not left to wonder why those who have been raised from the dead never told the story of what they saw or heard. They had none to tell. They were unconsciously sleeping, and were unable to take note of passing events. Then it is not a strange thing after all. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 119.7*

But there is one strange thing about this matter, and that is how, in the face of all these Bible texts, a Doctor of Divinity could write such a paragraph as that quoted at the beginning of this article. *W.SITI February 24, 1887, page 119.8*

"Scripture Statements vs. Conjecture" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

We cannot refrain from expressing the wish that the writers of the Sunday-school lesson notes in some of the religious papers, would occasionally read what the Bible says upon the subject of the lesson. If they should, it would save them from some egregious blunders, and would be a mercy to the pupils whose ideas are moulded in large measure by the lesson notes in their favorite journals. The lesson entitled "Lot's choice" was improved by nearly everyone to moralize on the wickedness of Lot. The *Christian Standard* writer ended his sentimentalism as follows:-*SITI February 24, 1887, page 120.1*

"Lot pitched his tent towards Sodom, then entered the city, ceased to be shocked by its gross sins and idolatry, was humiliated by being captured and plundered by the five kings. His soul hardened against even such direct warnings as angel messengers from Heaven. At last forced to flee from the city empty-handed, and look back on what once seemed the garden of the Lord, as a fiery furnace, he makes his home in the caves of the earth, and finally ends life a drunken outcast, dishonored by men and disowned by God." *SITI February 24, 1887, page 120.2*

Now read in *2 Peter 2:4-8* that God condemned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah with an overthrow, turning them into ashes, "and delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked (for that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds)." *SITI February 24, 1887, page 120.3*

Lot may have been selfish in his choice of territory, although the Scripture nowhere gives any intimation of such a thing. But we do have emphatic testimony to his righteousness, and that he himself was uncontaminated by the horrible wickedness around him, and from which he suffered greatly. Unscriptural morals are among the worst things written. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 120.4*

In this connection we would call attention to the International Lesson Notes that are given every week in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. The writer indulges in no guess-work, but directs the student's attention solely to the Bible. Sunday-school teachers and students will find it to their advantage to read the Commentary Department in the SIGNS. Those notes alone will more than make up for the price of the paper. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 120.5*

"The Lord's Prayer" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

When Christ was on earth he prayed often, sometimes spending whole nights in prayer. Of course none of these prayers are recorded. We have, however, the record of several prayers which he offered in public, prominent among which are the prayer at the grave of Lazarus, and the one for his disciples, just before his betrayal and crucifixion. But neither of these is referred to by the term, "the Lord's prayer." That prayer is the brief petition which our Saviour gave as a model for all prayers. And a model it is indeed. It comprehends

everything that it is possible for man to desire from God. There are no circumstances or conditions in life that are not covered by this petition. Yet this must be understood as applying to followers of Christ, and not to unconverted persons, even though they be convicted of sin. This will appear in the course of our comments upon the prayer. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 122.1*

There is no other form of words ever devised which can be used as a prayer over and over again for years, and still retain its freshness. This is simply because this one was given by One who knew man's needs. But our Saviour did not design that his disciples should simply repeat the words which he gave them. This is evident from the introduction: "*After this manner therefore pray ye.*" It was designed as we have said, as a comprehensive model. Let us consider it well, that we may henceforth pray with more of the Spirit and the understanding. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 122.2*

"OUR FATHER"

What tenderness is expressed in those words! What infinite condescension it reveals on the part of God to allow poor, frail mortals to address him thus. His greatness is unsearchable and his ways past finding out. Before him, "The nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance; behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing. And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering. All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity." *Isaiah 40:15-17*. He walks "upon the wings of the wind" (*Psalms 104:3*); he "hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of his feet." *Nahum 1:3*. And yet this awful God has the tenderness of a parent, and his ear is open to the supplications of those who whisper, even in faintest accents, "Our Father," for we are told that "like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." *Psalms 103:13*. Although God is the "high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy," he has assured us that he dwells with him that is "of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." *Isaiah 57:15*. Thus the first words of the Lord's prayer bring us into the most intimate relation with the great Creator. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 122.3*

Even in the first word alone there is a great truth conveyed. It shows the relation of those who can call God Father. They are brethren, having common hopes and needs. Even in his secret devotions, the Christian is not to make his petitions wholly personal. He is not to be shut up to his own needs, but is to remember that he is only one of a great family, whose welfare ought to be with him scarcely second to his own. Paul wrote to the Romans: "For God is my witness, whom I serve with my spirit in the gospel of his Son, that without ceasing I make mention of you always in my prayers." *Romans 1:9*. It is possible for a person to be selfish even in his petitions for overcoming grace; but it will be found in that case, as in all others, that selfishness defeats itself. Every Christian will bear witness to the fact that the richest blessings have come to him when, even though almost overwhelmed with a sense of his own need, he has coupled his petition for pardon and strength, with a request for a blessing upon others besides himself. And so, even in the closet, we are to say, "Our Father." *SITI February 24, 1887, page 122.4*

It is not everybody, however, who can say, "Our Father." We hear much of the "Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," but the Bible says nothing about such a thing. All men are not sons of God. Paul reminds the Ephesians of the time before they were converted, saying, "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." *Ephesians 2:12*. In the first verses he shows still more plainly that men are not by nature the children of God. He says: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Again the apostle warns the Ephesian brethren against the sins to which they had formerly been addicted, saying, "For because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience." *Ephesians 5:6*. See also *Colossians 3:6*. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 122.5*

But the plainest statement of all, that men are not by nature the children of God, was given by our Saviour himself. To the wicked Jews who said, "We have one Father, even God," he said: "If God were your Father, ye would love me; for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me.... Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." *John 8:41-44*. Putting these texts together, we learn that all who know not God are the children of wrath; they are the children, or recipients, of wrath, because they are children of disobedience because they are the children of the devil. Now a person cannot at the same time be a child of God and a child of Satan. Nor is it necessary that one should be as hardened as were the Jews to whom Christ spoke, in order that they may be called children of Satan. "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." *John 8:34*. If a person is a child of disobedience and of darkness, he is not a child of God. "All have sinned," and therefore none are by nature children of God. *SITI February 24,*

How do people become children of God? If they are not natural children, it must be by adoption. So Paul says: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba [Father], Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." *Romans 8:14-17*. In like manner he writes to the Galatians: "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." *Galatians 4:4-7*. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 123.2*

In the above text it will be noticed that the Spirit is the pledge of our adoption. It is called the Spirit of adoption, because only those who have it are sons of God. Indeed, its reception constitutes us sons of God. If we are children, then we are heirs of God; and so Paul says that the Spirit is "the earnest [or pledge] of our inheritance." *Ephesians 1:14*. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 123.3*

If we are heirs of God, we are joint heirs with Christ. All that Christ has or is to have, we shall have also. He is the Son of God by birth; the only begotten Son of God. Angels are the sons of God (*Job 38:7*) by creation. Adam was a son of God in the same way, only a little lower than the angels. If he had not sinned against God, his descendants would like him have been sons of God. But he transferred his allegiance to Satan, and so no man from Adam down can be a son of God except by adoption. "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." *John 3:3*. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 123.4*

From this brief study of the Scripture it is clearly evident that since the Lord's prayer begins, "Our Father," it cannot be used by one who is not a child of God. For those who are in a state of nature, and thus children of wrath, there is another prayer. It is, "God be merciful to me, a sinner." They cannot address the Creator as Father, but only as God, the Judge who, however, is able to save as well as to destroy. If they have once been adopted into the family of God, and have lost their heirship through sin, the same prayer is applicable. With David, under like circumstances, they may cry: "Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving-kindness; according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions." "Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities." "Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free Spirit." But only those with whose spirits the Spirit of God bears witness that they are children of God, can with confidence repeat the tender words, "Our Father." *SITI February 24, 1887, page 123.5*

Yet not a long time must the sinner lie a suppliant at the throne of God, unable to utter those words. God is longing for the world to become reconciled to him. When the prodigal son, who had forfeited his right to a place in his father's house, said, "I will arise, and go unto my father," not as a son but as a servant seeking mercy, his father met him while he was yet a long way off. He met him not as a master, but as a father. The humble prodigal did not have time to call himself a servant before he was embraced as a son. And so, although no one in a state of nature can properly repeat the Lord's prayer, at the first sincere petition for mercy, which the repentant sinner puts up to God, the Spirit of God is sent forth into his heart, and he becomes a son, and can confidently and joyfully say, Father, Father. *W. SITI February 24, 1887, page 123.6*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

There is a significant statement in Kate Foote's last Washington letter to the *Independent*. She says: "Washington needs hospitals. At present there is only one which receives an appropriation from Congress, - the Catholic hospital." Straws show which way the wind blows. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.1*

Elder C. I. Boyd, of Oregon, is spending a few days visiting with friends in Oakland and Healdsburg. Last Sabbath he preached to the church in Oakland, on the spirituality of the law of God. Elder Boyd is this far on his way East, whence he intends to start some time in May for his new field of labor in South Africa. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.2*

Last Friday the overland mails which were snowbound in the Sierras for five days began to arrive. The experience of the several hundred passengers who were imprisoned in a snow shed for five days, was not pleasant, but no accident occurred to any. The *Mariposa*, upon which Brother Byron Belden and wife sailed for Australia, was delayed six days after her regular sailing time, awaiting the arrival of the English mail. *SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.3*

Just as we were closing up this number of the SIGNS, we received a copy of the *Weekly Gazette*, of Little

Rock, Arkansas, which contains the speech of Senator Crockett in behalf of those whose conscientious observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, has caused them to be oppressed by the present unjust Sunday law of that State. The Senator speech is in support of a bill which he had introduced, granting immunity to those who keep the Sabbath, and which is referred to by our correspondent, in another column of this paper. We shall publish the speech in our next issue. It is an able effort, and well worth reading.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.4*

An Eastern paper says: "A strong temperance movement has been developed in London." And the reason for the statement is formed principally in the fact that upon "a recent Sunday all the drinking places in that great city were closed." But as the saloons continue running as usual six days in the week we fail to see that any great strength has been developed in behalf of *temperance*. To close saloons only on Sunday is to tacitly admit that the liquor business is legitimate on all other days. "Sunday closing" and "high license" are not in the interests of prohibition; for the more "respectable" and law abiding the saloon business becomes, the more dangerous it is, and the harder to suppress altogether.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.5*

Some time ago we were taken severely to task for designating as Mormons those people who masquerade under the high-sounding and pretentious title of the "Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints." A late number of a paper published in Oakland by one of this sect has found its way into our hands, and in it we find a long eulogy of Joe Smith, the founder of Mormonism, an extract from the "Book of Mormon," and a fierce onslaught upon Congress and the Federal Courts for the "persecution" of the Utah polygamists. Surely this is Mormonism. It should be understood by all, that any who eulogize Joe Smith, and who profess to be his followers, must be, theoretically, at least, in favor of polygamy, for he introduced the Turkish harem into the United States, as the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants" plainly shows.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.6*

Last Friday evening, February 18, a meeting was held in Hamilton Hall, Oakland, to discuss the merits of the Sunday bill which is now before both Houses of the California Legislature. Addresses were made by Lawyer Fox and Dr. Briggs, of Napa. Two leading clergy of Oakland occupied the stand. The bill now under consideration prohibits all labor on Sunday, but provides for the exception of those who conscientiously believe that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and who actually observe it, provided they do not disturb any Sunday observer by their labor. We have not space to give any report of the meeting, but will simply say that the remarks which elicited the most applause, both from the clergy and the people, were those in which the speakers declared that no exception should be made in favor of anybody, even though they kept Sabbath strictly, and did not disturb anybody by their labor on Sunday. The section exempting Sabbath-keepers was severely criticized. They do not expect the bill to be passed at this session of the Legislature, but they say that they must agitate the matter so thoroughly that the next Legislature will not dare to refuse what they want. Agitate, agitate, agitate, is their cry. We propose to help them. Next week we shall give some space to the bill and to their discussion of it.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.7*

It is no slight testimonial to the care with which our news columns are gotten up, that our exchanges copy the items quite largely. Some of the most "live" papers sometime transfer our news matter almost bodily to their columns, and thereby show their good taste. It is doubtless enterprise like this which makes them live papers. None of our matter is copyrighted, and we are glad to be of use to others. We think we can say to our patrons, without fear of contradiction, that there is no other weekly paper that furnishes the news of the day so fully and so accurately, and at the same time so concise and free from all irrelevant matter, as the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. It contains all the news that you could learn from a daily paper, and is free from sensational and vulgar rubbish.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.8*

Said Dr. Briggs at the recent Sunday Law Meeting: "The saloon on the 'Lord's day' [Sunday] is full of deadly peril." Well, isn't it full of deadly peril on other days? Is it ever anything else but an unmitigated curse to society? Does it not make paupers and criminals whenever it does anything? Certainly it does, for it has no other work but to make criminals. Then why single out Sunday as the time when it is full of deadly peril? Would Dr. Briggs say, "A murder committed on Sunday is a terrible thing?" If he should it would be true, but would it be any more terrible than if committed on Monday? Such an expression would seem to affirm that it would be. And so his statement concerning saloons on Sunday implies that they are harmless on other days. Yet it is claimed that the Sunday movement is in the interest of temperance! We can demonstrate that it not only is not, but that it tends to the strengthening of the liquor traffic.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.9*

The *Interior* says that it would "admit a colored man to membership in our church without hesitation, provided there were no such church of his own accessible; but if there were, we would advise him to go to his own. If this be wrong, then there is no limit this side of the perfect fusion of the two races into a yellow mass inferior to either of them." The *United Presbyterian* calls this "strained reasoning." It is worse than that. It is based on the rapidly growing theory that the church is a society into which none but those of "our set" can be admitted, and that church fellowship is equivalent to admission into "good society." We pity those who have so limited an idea of what Christian fellowship means that they would receive none but those who have been as highly

avored by nature as they. The apostle Paul says of those who have "put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him," that "there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all, and in all." What the churches need is more of Christ and less of "society."*SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.10*

He who is satisfied with simply believing the truth, is not entitled to the name Christian. The prayer of the Saviour, Father, "sanctify them through thy truth" (*John 17:17*), was for all in every age who should believe; and the soul in whom that petition is not being answered may well doubt that he is born of God.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 126.11*

"A Sign of the Times" The Signs of the Times, 13, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Princeton Review* for January, there is an article by the late Rev. A. A. Hodge, D. D., of Princeton, on "Religion in the Public Schools," in which the following significant words occur:*SITI February 24, 1887, page 128.1*

"All we have to do is for Catholics and Protestants-disciples of a common Master-to come to a common understanding with respect to a common basis of what is received as general Christianity, a practical quantity of truth belonging equally to both sides to be recognized in general legislation, and especially in the literature and teachings of our public schools. The difficulties lie in the mutual ignorance and prejudice of both parties, and fully as much on the side of the Protestants as of the Catholics."*SITI February 24, 1887, page 128.2*

The *Occident*, of San Francisco, says of Dr. Hodge's article, "It may be considered a dying legacy of this able and lamented minister." And of the portion in which the above paragraph occurs, it says: "These suggestions are worthy of earnest consideration." Here we have the spectacle of one of the leading Presbyterian divines in the content advocating virtual union with Catholicism, and admitting that Catholics have as much truth as Protestants, and the whole thing approved by his brother Presbyterians. Shades of Knox and Calvin! Where is Protestantism? It has already turned, or is fast turning, Catholic. What the end will be, it needs not a prophet to foresee.*SITI February 24, 1887, page 128.3*

March 3, 1887

“The Coming of Christ” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

Under this title, after speaking of the several unscriptural and fanciful interpretations which are given to the promise of our Saviour, “I will come again” (*John 14:3*), the Methodist Recorder says:—*SITI March 3, 1887, page 128.4*

Other interpreters regard it, and we think correctly, as referring it, and we think correctly, as referring particularly to the personal appearing of Christ at the end of the world. It is a broad, comprehensive promise, intended not only for the apostles, but for believers in every subsequent age. It is the same as if he had said, “I will not stay always in Heaven; I will, after awhile, at a time which it is not now proper to reveal, come back to you.” *SITI March 3, 1887, page 128.5*

The object of Christ’s departure from his disciples, as he plainly informs us, was that he might prepare a place for them. And the object of his coming again, he declares, will be to receive them to himself, that where he is, there they may be also. This very clearly shows that his coming again does not refer to his appearance to his disciples after his resurrection, nor to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, but to his second coming, at the end of the world, to be glorified in his saints, and admired by all them that love him. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 128.6*

This visible, personal coming of Christ is that which was announced by the angels to his disciples at his ascension. “This same Jesus,” said they, “which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.” This is in harmony with the entire teachings of God’s word on the subject. The apostle Paul assures us that “unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.” And, “when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.” “For,” says he again, “the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” *SITI March 3, 1887, page 128.7*

When Christ instituted the last Supper, he commanded his followers to observe it in remembrance of him, until his coming again. The volume of divine truth closes with the blessed assurance of his coming. “He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.” *SITI March 3, 1887, page 128.8*

This is the glorious hope of the church and of every true believer, the return of the Saviour—the coming of the Bridegroom. The church shall not always mourn her absent Head. Believers in Jesus shall not always be left in orphanage. The Master says, “I will come again.” Blessed assurance and hope! *SITI March 3, 1887, page 128.9*

“A Weighty and Timely Utterance” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

THE FATHERS—THEIR UNRELIABILITY

The next head under which Mr. Bailey “proves” his proposition is the testimony of the Fathers. And right here a quotation from the *Examiner and Chronicle*, a standard Baptist paper, is to the point. Some years ago a correspondent of this paper, signing himself Rev. Philetus Dobbs, D. D., stated that he had received a letter from a young minister, asking how he should prove a thing when there is nothing with which to prove it; and a portion of his reply is as follows:—*SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.1*

“I regard, however, a judicious use of the Fathers as being on the whole the best reliance for anyone who is in the situation of my querist. The advantages of the Fathers are twofold: First, they carry a good deal of weight with the masses; and secondly, you can find whatever you want in the Fathers. I do not believe that any opinion could be advanced so foolish, so manifestly absurd, but that you can find passages to sustain it on the pages of these venerable staggers. And to the common mind one of these is just as good as another. If it happens that the point that you want to prove is one that never chanced to occur to the Fathers, why you can easily show that they would have taken your side if they had only thought of the matter. And if, perchance, there is nothing bearing even remotely or constructively on the point, do not be discouraged; get a good,

strong quotation, and put the name of the Fathers to it, and utter it with an air of triumph; it will be all just as well; nine-tenths of the people do not stop to ask whether a quotation bears on the matter in hand. Yes, my brother, the Fathers are your stronghold. They are Heaven's best gift to the man who has a cause that cannot be sustained in any other way." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.2*

The aptness with which this applies to the case in hand will be seen as we proceed. But first we want to give a few quotations to show in what esteem that Fathers are held by some of the best writers, who are themselves first-day observers. We first quote from Mosheim. Speaking of certain works by Clement, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theophilus, etc., he says that these works are lost, and adds: *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.3*

"But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that no one of these expositors could be pronounced a good interpreter. They believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings, the one obvious, and corresponding with the direct import of the words, the other recondite, and concealed under the words like a nut by the shell; and, neglecting the former as being of little value, they bestowed their chief attention on the latter; that is, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings by the fictions of their own imaginations, than on searching out their true meaning." *Ecclesiastical History, book 1, cent. 2, part. 2, chap. 3, sec. 5. SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.4*

Archdeacon Farrar in his latest work, "History of Interpretation," says of the Fathers: *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.5*

"There are but few of them whose pages are not rife with errors,-errors of method, errors of fact, errors of history, of grammar, and even of doctrine; this is the language of simple truth, and not of slighting disparagement."-*Pp. 162, 163. SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.6*

On page 164 of the same book, Farrar says: *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.7*

"Without deep learning, without linguistic knowledge, without literary culture, without any final principles either as to the nature of the sacred writings or the method by which they should be interpreted,-surrounded by Paganism, Judaism, and heresy of every description, and wholly dependent on a faulty translation,-the earliest Fathers and apologists add little or nothing to our understanding of Scripture.... Their acquaintance with the Old Testament is incorrect, popular, and full of mistakes; their scriptural arguments are often baseless; their exegesis-novel in application only-is a chaos of elements unconsciously borrowed on the one hand from Philo, and on the other from Rabbis and Kabbalists. They claim 'a grace' of exposition, which is not justified by the results they offer, and they suppose themselves to be in possession of a Christian Gnosis, of which the specimens offered are for the most part entirely untenable." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.8*

Dr. Clarke in his comment on *Proverbs 8* says of the Fathers: *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.9*

"But of these we may safely state that there is not a truth in the most orthodox creed that cannot be proved by their authority, nor a heresy that has disgraced the Romish Church that may not challenge them as its abettors. In points of doctrine their authority is with me nothing." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.10*

Chambers's Encyclopedia says of the Fathers: *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.11*

"Of those who head the list, the Apostolic Fathers-so called from their supposed connection with Christ and the apostles-very little need be said, as their writings, which are mostly of an ascetical character, have come down to us in a corrupt and mutilated state, and as the writers themselves owe their chief celebrity to the times in which they happened to live." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.12*

We might add many more testimonies to the incompetency and unreliability of the Fathers, but we will pass to notice the special ones which are referred to by Mr. Bailey. He begins thus: *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.13*

TESTIMONY OF "BARNABAS"

"Barnabas was a fellow-laborer with Paul. Several of the epistles of Barnabas have been published, believed by many of the best scholars to be genuine, though not inspired. Yet as a witness of the customs of the early churches, we may believe his testimony. General epistle of Barnabas 13:9, 10: 'Lastly he saith unto them, Your new moons and your Sabbaths, I cannot bear them. Consider what he means by it; the Sabbaths, says he, which ye now keep are not acceptable unto me, but those which I have made, when, resting from all things, I shall begin the eighth day, that is, the beginning of the other world. For which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness, in which Jesus rose from the dead, and having manifested himself to the disciples, he ascended into Heaven.' Did not Barnabas know what day the early churches were to keep as the Christian Sabbath?" *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.14*

We are strongly of the opinion that Mr. Bailey has never seen a set of the writings ascribed to the Fathers. He

says "several of the epistles of Barnabas have been published." We have two editions of the Anti-Nicene Fathers, and in neither of them is there more than one epistle ascribed to Barnabas. All the church historians of which we have any knowledge speak of "the epistle of Barnabas," but never of the epistles. But that is a matter of no consequence, for if there were forty "epistles of Barnabas" the world would only be so much the worse off. We will now investigate this so-called "epistle of Barnabas," and its author. Bishop Arthur Cleveland Coxe, in his introductory note to the epistle of Barnabas, published by the Christian Literature Publishing Company, says:-*SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.15*

"The writer of this epistle is supposed to have been an Alexandrian Jew of the times of Trajan and Hadrian. He was a layman; but possibly he bore the name of 'Barnabas' and so has been confounded with his holy apostolic namesake." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.16*

The original introductory note by those who translated the epistle for the Edinburgh edition contains the following:-*SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.17*

"Nothing certain is known as to the author of the following epistle. The writer's name is Barnabas, but scarcely any scholars now ascribe it to the illustrious friend and companion of St. Paul.... On perusing the epistle the reader will be in circumstances to judge of this matter for himself. He will be led to consider whether the spirit and tone of the writing, as so decidedly opposed to all respect for Judaism-the numerous inaccuracies which it contains with respect to Mosaic enactment; and observances-the absurd and trifling interpretations of Scripture which it suggests-and the many silly vaunts of superior knowledge in which its writer indulges-can possibly comport with its ascription to the fellow-laborer of St. Paul. When it is remembered that no one ascribes the epistle to the apostolic Barnabas till the times of Clement of Alexandria, and that it is ranked by Eusebius among the 'spurious' writings, which, however much known and read in the church, were never regarded as authoritative, little doubt can remain that the external evidence is of itself weak, and should not make us hesitate for a moment in refusing to ascribe this writing to Barnabas the apostle.... In point of style, both as respects thought and expression, a very low place must be assigned it. We know nothing certain of the region in which the author lived, or where the first readers were to be found." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.18*

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says of this epistle:-*SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.19*

"The opinion to-day is that Barnabas was not the author. The epistle was probably written in Alexandria at the beginning of the second century, and by a Gentile Christian." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.20*

Mosheim says:-*SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.21*

"The epistle of Barnabas, as it is called, was in my judgment the production of some Jewish Christian who lived in this century [the first] or the next, who had no bad intentions, but possessed little genius and was infected with the fabulous opinions of the Jews. He was clearly a different person from Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul."-*Book 1, cent. 1, part 2, chap. 2, sec. 21. SITI March 3, 1887, page 134.22*

These last two quotations show how little is known about the man who wrote this epistle. One supposes that he was a Jew, the other a Gentile, and none pretend to know when he lived. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.1*

McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia says:-*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.2*

"An epistle has come down to us bearing the name of Barnabas, but clearly not written by him.... The writer evidently has been unacquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and has committed the blunder of supposing that Abraham was familiar with the Greek alphabet some centuries before it existed." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.3*

Dr. Kitto in his "Encyclopedia of Religious Literature" says:-*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.4*

"He makes unauthorized additions to various parts of the Jewish Cultus; his views of the Old Economy are confused and erroneous; and he adopts a mode of interpretation countenanced by none of the inspired writers, and at utter variance with every principle of sound criticism, being to the last degree puerile and absurd. The inference is unavoidable that Barnabas, 'the son of prophecy,' 'the man full of the Holy Spirit and of faith,' was not the author of this epistle." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.5*

Dr. Schaff, "History of the Christian Church," sec. 121, says:-*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.6*

"A genuine production of Barnabas would doubtless have found a place in the Canon, with the writings of Mark and Luke and the epistle to the Hebrews. Besides, the contents of this epistle are not worthy of him. It has many good ideas and forcible testimonies, such as that in favor of the observance of the Christian Sabbath, but it goes to extremes in opposition to Judaism, and indulges in all sorts of artificial, sometimes

absurd and allegorical fancies." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.7*

But what if he does? What if the epistle is a forgery made by some unknown and irresponsible person? What if its writer was an ignoramus who indulged in the most absurd notions? He gives "valuable testimony" in favor of the observance of the "Christian Sabbath," and that is sufficient to secure the epistle a place in "Christian literature" as long as time lasts. It will not be long, we apprehend, before these principles will be carried out to a greater extent, and the vilest man will be welcome in so-called Christian churches, if he is only zealous in his observance of Sunday, and in persecuting those who do not observe it. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.8*

But what about this "valuable testimony" given by this fellow who steals the name of Barnabas? Why, he says that "we keep the *eighth day* with joyfulness." Perhaps some admirer of this epistle will tell us when the "eighth day of the week" comes, and how Sunday can be both the first day and the eighth day of a week of seven days. We might quote from the epistle abundance of matter demonstrating the truth of what has been said about it, but much of it is unfit for publication in these columns. We will however give one quotation, which the author of the epistle regarded as much more valuable testimony than that concerning the "eighth day." In the last part of chapter nine he says: *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.9*

"Learn, then, my children, concerning all things richly, that Abraham, the first who enjoined circumcision, looking forward in spirit to Jesus, practiced that rite, having received the mysteries of the three letters. For (the Scripture) saith, 'And Abraham circumcised ten, and eight, and three hundred men of his household.' What then was the knowledge given to him in this? Learn the eighteen first, and then the three hundred. The ten and the eight are thus denoted-ten by I, and eight by H. You have (the initials of the name of) Jesus. And because the cross was to express the grace (of our redemption), by the letter T, he says also. 'Three hundred.' He signifies therefore Jesus by two letters, and the cross by one. He knows this which has put within us the engrafted gift of his doctrine. No one has been admitted by me to a more excellent piece of knowledge than this, but I know that ye are worthy." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.10*

With this we leave the pseudo-Barnabas. W. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.11*

(*To be continued.*)

"Sunday-Law Meeting in Oakland" The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

According to previous appointment in the newspapers of Oakland and San Francisco, a meeting in the interest of a Sunday law was held in Oakland, on the evening of the 18th ult. This meeting was called for the purpose of "discussing the merits" of the bill which was introduced into the Legislature February 15, by Mr. Knox, of Los Angeles. Unlike the convention that was held in San Francisco, last fall, and which was reported in the SIGNS of December 9, this meeting was remarkable for the unanimity of sentiment expressed. The meeting seemed to have been carefully planned, and everybody knew just what was expected of him. The principal speakers of the evening were Mr. Fox, an Oakland criminal lawyer, and Rev. Dr. M. C. Briggs, of Napa. The stand was occupied by quite a number of the leading clergy of Oakland, who manifested their approval of the sentiments expressed, by frequent applause. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.12*

As showing how careful the managers of the meeting were to secure perfect harmony, we will state that at the close of the meeting some resolutions favoring a Sunday law were read, and, as reported in the papers, were adopted by "a rising and almost unanimous vote." But we were there, and saw the proceeding. The chairman called for all who favored the resolutions to arise. Perhaps more than half the congregation arose, when the chairman immediately announced, "Carried," without giving any a chance to dissent except by keeping their seats. This is possibly a good way to get a vote "without a single dissenting voice," in order to spur on unwilling legislation, but it is not a good way to convince thinking people of the justice of a cause. Any cause that cannot endure a free expression of opinion, and that is not so strongly entrenched in reason and justice as to be willing to court the fullest investigation, ought to fall by its own weight. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.13*

The bill under consideration is known in the lower House as Assembly Bill, No. 520, and reads as follows:- *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.14*

"SECTION 1. There is hereby added a new section to the Penal Code, to be known as section two hundred and ninety-nine, which shall read as follows:- *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.15*

"299. Every person who shall expose to or offer for sale any goods, wares, or merchandise, or shall keep open any store, workshop, or other place of business, bar, or saloon, or shall sell or give away to be drunk as a beverage any spirituous, vinous, malt, or other intoxicating liquor, upon the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, is guilty of a misdemeanor. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.16*

"SEC. 2. There is hereby added a new section to the Penal Code, to be known as section three hundred, which shall read as follows:-*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.17*

"300. Every person who shall engage in any riot, fighting, horse-racing, gaming, or other public sports, exercises, or shows, on Sunday; and any person who shall keep open on Sunday any place where such public sports, exercises, or shows are carried on, is guilty of a misdemeanor.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.18*

"SEC. 3. There is hereby added a new section to the Penal Code, to be known as section three hundred, which shall read as follows:-*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.19*

"301. Every person who shall either labor himself or compel his apprentice, servant, or other person under his charge or control, to labor or perform any work, other than works of necessity or charity, on Sunday, is guilty of a misdemeanor.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.20*

"SEC. 4. This Act shall not extend to any person who conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as a Sabbath, and who actually observes such Sabbath;*provided*, that in the pursuit of his labor or business he disturbs no other person.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.21*

"SEC. 5. Each violation of any of the provisions of this Act shall be construed to constitute a separate and complete offense; and for each violation the person or persons offending shall be liable to the penalties provided for any law.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.22*

"SEC. 6. This Act shall take effect immediately."*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.23*

Mr. FOX, the first speaker, read the first four sections of this bill, and then announced himself as unqualifiedly opposed to section 4. Said He: "The strongest argument in favor of a Sunday law is based on the law of nature. It is an argument which is presented by God himself. Everything that lives must have a weekly day of rest, or must suffer. This is a divine command, made manifest through all nature. Hence all civilized nations should provide for the observance of that command; and you cannot provide for it unless you make the day of rest universal. Therefore the Sunday law must not except anybody."*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.24*

This bit of sophistry was greeted with uproarious applause, the clergy on the stand using both hands and feet vigorously. We cite this to show the spirit actuating those who plead for a Sunday law. We were privately informed by one of the reverend gentlemen who was instrumental in getting up the meeting, that the managers were not responsible for the sentiments expressed by Mr. Fox, and that they did not indorse him. We told him that if that were the case they should have disavowed such sentiments at the time. Instead of a word of dissent, however, the other speaker of the evening came out still more emphatically, mentioning Seventh-day Adventists by name, and said that although he had respect for them as a people, no exemption should be made in their behalf; and this statement was also received with applause. If the advocates of Sunday laws are in favor of justice, they have an unfortunate way of showing it.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.25*

Let the reader carefully examine the proposed law, and then consider Mr. Fox's "strongest argument," by which he "proved" the impossibility of making any exception in favor of Sabbath-keepers. The bill provides that no work whatever, except works of necessity or charity, shall be performed on Sunday by anybody, unless he has actually rested on the seventh day of the week. Thus the proposed law, if carried into effect, would insure a weekly rest of one day to every individual in the State; and yet the speaker claimed that the "law of nature" which demands a weekly rest could not be obeyed if section 4 were retained. Is not "sophistry" a mild term to apply to such "argument"? He virtually claimed that this "law of nature" demands that the weekly rest shall fall on Sunday; that if men rest on Saturday instead of Sunday they will suffer physically! The only "law of nature" which demands that men shall rest upon Sunday, and on no other day, is the natural depravity which is in the heart of man, which receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.26*

To say that such a law as was pleaded for at that meeting would not be unjust, and would not result in the persecution of those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week, is an insult to the intelligence of thinking people. Read the speech of Senator Crockett on pages 131, 132 of this paper, for a refutation of such a claim.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.27*

The speakers were careful to let it be understood that they did not want a religious law, but a civil law. They did not want any law in behalf of religion, but only to help the poor laboring man. This is a bit of sophistry that looks so plausible that it will catch very many. Of course they want a civil law, for a State law could be nothing else. But Sunday is a religious institution; we do not mean that it is a divine institution, but that it is purely a church ordinance, and therefore a religious institution, even though human in its origin. Now a State law compelling men to keep Sunday is a civil law, to be sure, but a civil law establishing a custom of religion. Such laws constitute, so far as they extend, a union of Church and State. Baptism is purely a religious ordinance, but a State law compelling all men to be baptized would be a civil law. But such civil laws are what we protest

against. We do not believe in the State stepping out of its sphere to interfere in matters purely religious.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.28*

But it was not possible for those who took part in the meeting to conceal their desire for a law upholding Sunday in its religious aspect. In his opening prayer, Dr. Gray prayed that the people might be made to feel the necessity of "hedging about with legal enactments that holy day which came to us from Sinai." (?) The Doctor must have misspoken himself, for it is not the seventh day, but the first, that they desire to have upheld by civil law, and he well knows that the Sunday-sabbath has no more connection with Sinai than has the Friday rest of the Mohammedans. But nevertheless he showed what he wanted. He also prayed that the people of this city, and the legislators, might "realize the sanctity of the Lord's day." And Dr. Briggs, in his speech, complained that moral instruction was relegated to the churches, and then the people were allowed to go their own ways on Sunday, so that they could not get at them to give the needed moral instruction. That is to say, the gospel which they preach has not power enough to reach the masses, and they want a law enforcing Sunday observance, so that people will be drawn to church on Sunday for want of any other place to go. With such a desire in the minds of the Sunday-law advocates, how long would it be before they would beg for a law compelling all people to go to church on Sunday, if they should find that in spite of the rigid Sunday law, the people persisted in neglecting church privileges?*SITI March 3, 1887, page 135.29*

We have still further evidence that it is not simply in the interest of good order, and to insure rest for the laboring man, that the Sunday law is wanted. Mr. Fox said: "Strike out section 4 [loud "Amen" from the ministers behind him], because it gives everybody a choice of two days; and then those who don't want any Sunday won't have any." True; pass a law requiring all people to keep Sunday, excepting those who keep the Sabbath, and then those who believe in keeping the seventh-day instead of the first, won't keep Sunday! Of course not; and that is what some, at least, of these Sunday-law advocates object to. We can inform them that whatever law they pass, those who conscientiously believe that "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," will not keep Sunday. When civil laws run in direct opposition to the plainly expressed commandment of the Lord, duty is very clear.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 136.1*

We have not space in this article to notice all the "arguments" that were put forth to show the absolute necessity of a strict Sunday law. They were all as strong as those which we have mentioned, and we shall refer to them in future articles. We wish it distinctly understood that we do not antagonize persons, but principles. We do not charge the reverend gentlemen who plead so strenuously for a strict Sunday law, with having a desire to oppress any people because of their conscientious convictions. We are perfectly willing to concede that they are deceived as to what would be the inevitable result of such a law as they desire; and we write for the purpose of enlightening people as to what the result will be. The bill if passed with section 4 struck out, would cause the most bitter persecution to arise against those who observe the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. It would be persecution of conscience' sake as much as any persecution instigated by the Inquisition. If the bill should be passed as it stands, it would grant, at the most, religious toleration, and not such religious liberty as should be guaranteed in this land of boasted freedom. It would leave the conscientious Sabbath-keeper liable to be arrested at the instance of every hyper-sensitive person who might fancy himself disturbed by quiet labor on Sunday; and although many of these charges might not be sustained, no end of trouble would be caused.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 136.2*

For this reason, we propose to do all in our power to agitate this matter. It is scarcely possible that a Sunday law can be passed at this session of the Legislature; but the friends of such a law say that they propose to begin now to work the matter up in season for the next session. We shall work with them; and while they show one side, we will show both sides. This is not a local matter, but one that concerns everybody; for the same arguments are used wherever Sunday laws are proposed. We desire that the matter shall be so fully canvassed that no one can be ignorant as to the natural working of Sunday laws; so that when such laws are finally adopted, as the prophecy foretells that they will be, no one need work for them except those who are perfectly willing to see persecution practiced upon the conscientious minority. W.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 136.3*

"Andrews' History of the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

This highly valuable book, after passing through two editions, has been revised, and enlarged by the addition of another chapter, and now appears for the third time, not in its former small type and plain black binding, but printed in large, clear type and bound in handsome and substantial style.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 137.1*

As many of our readers are aware, this work, by the late Elder J. N. Andrews, is the most complete history of the Bible Sabbath, and also of the first day of the week, ever written. And as it gives a multitude of facts not published elsewhere in the English language nor in any one book, and not attainable by any except those who have access to the largest libraries in this and other countries, no one can be said to be thoroughly intelligent

upon the Sabbath question till he has read this work.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 137.2*

As a writer, Elder Andrews had few equals and no superiors in his chosen field; and his "History of the Sabbath and First Day of the Week" bears evidence upon every page, not only of his ability to present in a thoroughly readable and interesting manner a subject often considered dry, but also of his ripe scholarship and of his great historical accuracy. Every statement made is supported either by plan and appropriate texts of Scripture, or by the most reliable historical reference.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 137.3*

Containing as it does a complete history of the Sabbath for 6,000 years, and of the first day of the week from the earliest periods, the book is one of rare value, and it should be in the hands of the people everywhere. The work contains 548 pages, a table of contents, a perfect index of subjects, an index of authors quoted and also one of Scripture texts used, besides a fine steel engraving of the author. The size of the page is 5 1/2 by 8 1/2 inches, and the general style and appearance of the book entitle it to a place in the finest libraries; while its literary merits cannot but favorably impress all who read it.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 137.4*

If the friends of the Bible Sabbath do their duty, hundreds of copies of this book will be sold in the future where scores have been in the past. This work is now in a shape that it can be handled as a subscription book; and in the hands of those whose hearts are in the work, it will no doubt sell as well as any religious publication. The Sabbath question is now being discussed all over the land as never before, and *now* is the time to sell the "History of the Sabbath."*SITI March 3, 1887, page 137.5*

The book is bound in three styles: cloth, with sprinkled edges, price \$2.00; library, marbled edges \$2.75; half Morocco, gilt, \$3.75.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 137.6*

For terms to agents, write to Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal., general agents for all territory west of the Rocky Mountains, or to *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 137.7*

"The Lord's Prayer. 'Who Art in Heaven'" The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

"WHO ART IN HEAVEN"

The fact that God is in Heaven is often used to indicate his power and majesty. The expression occurring in the model prayer indicates that whoever prays should recognize the greatness of the Being whom he addresses. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." *Hebrews 11:6*. We quote a few texts to show the comprehensiveness of the expression, "Who art in Heaven."*SITI March 3, 1887, page 139.1*

Psalms 103:19: "The Lord hath prepared his throne in the Heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all." *Psalms 115:3*: "But our God is in the Heavens; he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased." These texts show the power of God. The same thing is found in *2 Chronicles 20:6*: "O Lord God of our fathers, art not thou God in Heaven? and rulest not thou over all the kingdoms of the heathen? and in thine hand is there not power and might, so that none is able to withstand thee?" Whenever it is designed to indicate the power and majesty of God, his dwelling-place in Heaven is mentioned.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 139.2*

Psalms 11:4: "The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord's throne is in Heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men." Here God's dwelling-place in Heaven is mentioned to show his omniscience.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 139.3*

Jeremiah 23:24: "Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill Heaven and earth? saith the Lord." Here the omnipresence of God is indicated, as also in *1 Kings 8:27*: "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? behold, the Heaven and Heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded." And also *Isaiah 66:1*: "Thus saith the Lord, The Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool; where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest?"*SITI March 3, 1887, page 139.4*

Ecclesiastes 5:2: "Be not rash with thy mouth and let not thine heart be hasty to utter anything before God; for God is in Heaven, and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few." Here the fact that God is in Heaven is given as a reason for sobriety and carefulness of speech.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 139.5*

Thus we find that the expression in the Lord's Prayer, "Who art in Heaven," stands for a recognition of the power, the majesty, the omnipotence, and the omniscience of God. All these things should be borne in mind when we approach the throne of grace. This thought will tend to produce reverence and awe. Multiplication of words and "vain repetitions," for which Christ condemned the heathen, arise from the fact that the petitioner

thinks more of himself than he does of the one whom he is addressing. The heathen gods were so contemptible that the heathen worshiper could not help thinking more of himself than of his god; for heathen worship, in its inception, was self-worship. See *Romans 1:21-23*. But the God whom we worship sits upon the circle of the heavens, and he who has a just sense of his greatness will come with reverence into his presence, and will confine his words to just the things which he needs. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 139.6*

"HALLOWED BE THY NAME"

This follows as a natural consequence of that which precedes. The one who remembers the words, "There is none like unto the God of Jerusalem, who rideth upon the heavens in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky" (*Deuteronomy 33:26*), will of necessity "fear that glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD." *W.SITI March 3, 1887, page 139.7*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

For the present, the address of Elder C. I. Boyd, is Battle Creek, Mich. care of *Review and Herald*. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.1*

All communications for the President of the North Pacific Conference or Tract Society, should be addressed to Elder John Fulton, box 18, East Portland, Oregon. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.2*

We hereby acknowledge the receipt of the Ninth Biennial Report of the State Board of Health of California, for which we are indebted to our friend, Hon. N. A. Young of San Diego. This report contains some valuable temperance mater of which we shall give the readers of the SIGNS the benefit. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.3*

The *Interior* sometimes views things just as they are, and when it does, the prospect which it sees is not very flattering. Following is an instance:- *SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.4*

"The hope for the suppression of Socialism in Germany obviously does not lie in the Roman Catholic Church. Just now it is not easy to discover where it does lie. It might lie in the Protestant church, if that church would unite, and then, by works of humanity and love, prove that it had not lost both its life and its power. Of such a union and such efforts there seems to be no immediate prospect." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.5*

The same thing might be said of almost any other country. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.6*

It seems that the Pacific Coast is destined to be the place where spiritual manifestations shall most speedily attain the highest development. The *Golden Gate* says:- *SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.7*

"Certain it is that California, and especially the region along the coast, is remarkably favorable for spiritual and mediumistic development. There is probably right here in San Francisco a larger proportion of mediumistic persons than in any other city in the Union, and some of these mediums are equal to the best in the world." *SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.8*

We presume that this is so; but we regard it as anything but a compliment to California to be told that the devil can work through people here better than he can anywhere else. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.9*

The Rev. Hugh G. Pentecost, of Newark, N. J., preached on a recent Sunday evening on Henry ege. Said he: "For my part it is clear that Henry George is in the straight moral position; and since the great body of humanity always ends in doing what is right, the time will probably come when all rents will go to the general Government." We care nothing about this indorsement of Henry George, but we do object to the idea that "the great body of humanity always ends in doing what is right." We are sorry to see people give assent to such a sentiment. There has not been a century since the fall, in which, the great body of humanity was not wholly wrong. Unless people submit to be directed by the law of God, they must go wrong. And we have not much reason to hope that the great body of humanity will make great progress toward the truth of God when those who should lead them in the way preach on Henry George and kindred subjects, instead of preaching Christ and him crucified. *SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.10*

The *Oakland Enquirer* of February 20 said: "Last night's Sunday-law meeting excited considerable enthusiasm among those present, but it would be a difficult thing indeed to pass an act compelling those who regard the seventh day as the Sabbath to observe the first day. This is what all the speakers advocated, but they did not take counsel of discretion in doing it. There is a powerful element in the Christian churches, which would fight to the death against such a proposition." We would fain believe that our contemporary is correct in

its estimate of the feeling in the church in regard to a Sunday law. But not, in their demands that Sabbath-keepers should also keep Sunday, we are very sure that they did not take counsel of justice and religious liberty.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.11*

A correspondent of the *New York Observer* makes this confession, which must be very discouraging to those who are looking for a temporal millennium, when all men will be converted:-*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.12*

"We are compelled to believe by the stern army of facts and figures that at the end of this boasted century of missions, while not 3,000,000 converts, nominal and real, have been won to Christianity in pagandom, the heathen and Mohammedan are 200,000,000 more than they were at the beginning of the century; that the votaries of those faiths increase seventy times faster than the followers of Christ. The church is outstripped on its own methods. They evince in these modern days a propagandism and aggressiveness far superior. The necessity in the foreign field cannot be overtaken on the present line of church work."*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.13*

Yet many church people will persist in saying that the world is growing better.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.14*

"Against a Sunday law, but in favor of enacting a Sabbath Law," is the heading of an article that appeared in the *Oakland Tribune* one day last week, protesting against the proceedings at the recent Sunday-law meeting. The heading is most misleading. We do not know any man or body of men who are in favor of enacting a Sabbath law. The Sabbath is upheld by the law of God, and needs nothing more. If it were proposed to enact a law enforcing the observance of the Sabbath, and there was any probability of its carrying, we should vigorously oppose it. Our opposition to the enactment of Sunday laws is not alone on the ground that Sunday has no divine sanction, and is a working day as much as Monday or Tuesday, but because we are against the principle of the State legislating in matters of religion. The enactment of Sunday laws stands for union of Church and State, and this should be opposed by all Christians.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.15*

Some people have queer ideas of what constitutes religious liberty. Here in California the good people are trying to get a law that will compel all people to keep Sunday, even though some conscientiously keep another day; yet the Sunday people do not see in that any infringement upon religious liberty. And now comes the *Christian Church News*, and claims that a constitutional amendment prohibiting the "manufacture, gift, or sale of spirituous, malt, or vinous liquors, except for medicinal, mechanical, chemical, or scientific purposes," is oppressive because it does not provide for the use of intoxicating wine at communion. The editor says: "It is clear an infringement upon religious liberty, and an attempt to set aside the conscientious convictions of men." All of which causes us to conclude that with very many people "religious liberty" means liberty for themselves to do as they please, and compulsion for others to do likewise.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.16*

Said a clergyman to a seventh-day friend: "If you like to keep Saturday instead of Sunday, I could not say you would be breaking the law of God; but the people of God are against you." Well, that is a little strange. If God is not against us for keeping the seventh day, how can his people be against us? Are not the people of God those in whose heart is the law, and who do his will? God's people are those who walk with him; and two cannot walk together except they be agreed. Consequently his people cannot be against Sabbath-keeping. Moreover, if God is not against the keeping of the seventh day, then it cannot be wrong; for he is against all wrong; and if he is not against it, and it is not wrong, it must be right, and in harmony with his law, and so it is. See *Exodus 20:8-11*. And if God is not against seventh-day Sabbath-keeping, because it is in harmony with his law, and is right, he must be against Sunday-keeping, and it must be wrong; for two opposite practices cannot be right. We choose every time to be on the side of the Lord, even though we should be opposed by thousands calling themselves his people.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.17*

We hope that no one will delay to read the article beginning on the third page of this paper, entitled, "A Plea for Justice." The article is a speech by the Hon. Robert H. Crockett, of Arkansas, delivered in behalf of the bill which he had introduced into the Legislature of that State, allowing observers of the seventh day immunity from the penalties of the Sunday law. For two years a rigid Sunday law has been in force in Arkansas, with the result that religious persecution was rampant. We have mentioned this persecution several times, and have given some of the particulars; but we are glad to be able to give this testimony from a disinterested person. We hope that the people of other States where Sunday laws are being pressed, will consider well the experience of the people of Arkansas. Notwithstanding the intolerance of the law, and the persecution which it engendered, there were not wanting professed ministers of the gospel, who wished to have the law remain unchanged. Colonel Crockett, who, by the way, is a grandson of the famous David Crockett, gave the bill in favor of liberty his personal attention in both Houses, and by his energy and eloquence secured its passage in the Senate by a vote of 26 to 2, and in the Assembly by a vote of 55 to 16. The cause of religious freedom is greatly indebted to him for his successful effort in its behalf.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.18*

Our readers are aware that a few weeks since the German Parliament refused to pass the Government measure known as the Septenate, a bill to provide for a large increase in the German army, and to provide for

its maintenance for a period of seven years. Immediately upon the defeat of the bill, Prince Bismarck dissolved the Reichstag, and writs were at once issued for the election of a new Parliament.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.19*

The members of this new body have now been elected, and a majority is assured for the Government bill. This was accomplished, however, by the direct interference of the Pope himself. Hitherto the Papal influence has not been wanting in political matters even in our own country, but it has been exerted secretly through bishops and priests; but in this instance the "holy father" himself addressed a brief but mandatory letter to his vassals in Germany, directing them to support the Government candidates; hence Prince Bismarck's victory.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.20*

The question of passing the Septenate bill was purely a political one, and concerned only the German people, who will be taxed to raise the immense sums which the new Reichstag will be asked to vote, and from whose ranks will be drawn the many thousands of additional men which the iron chancellor demands. And yet the awful electors of the empire were not left to decide the question; it was decided not in Germany but in Rome; not by the people of a sovereign State but by the foreign head of an alien church. The fact is most significant, and shows how entirely even the great powers of the earth are at the mercy of the Papacy.*SITI March 3, 1887, page 144.21*

March 10, 1887

“A Weighty and Timely Utterance.’ (Continued.)” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

TESTIMONY OF IGNATIUS

The next Father who is quoted as authority for the observance of Sunday is Ignatius. We quote here all that Mr. Bailey claims for him. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.1*

“Ignatius was the bishop or pastor of the church of Antioch in Syria from the year 70 to 107. He was a disciple of John, and was pastor at Antioch for twenty-five years before John’s death. In his epistle to the Magnesians 3:3 he says: ‘Wherefore if they who were brought up in these ancient laws come nevertheless to newness of hope, no longer observing *Sabbaths*, but keeping the *Lord’s day*, in which also our life is sprung up by him, and through his death, some deny.’ *SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.2*

“Also Ignatius (quoted by Edwards in ‘Sabbath Manual,’ p. 113) says: ‘Let us Christian no more Sabbatize, keep the Lord’s day.’ ‘Let everyone that loves Christ keep holy the Lord’s day, the resurrection they, the highest of all days.’ *SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.3*

“Ignatius was arrested at Antioch when the Roman emperor, Trajan came there about the year 107, and was sent to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom, being torn in pieces by wild beasts. Did this early martyr and a disciple of John, who for thirty-seven years was pastor at Antioch Syria, a church which had the ministrations of inspired apostles—did he teach the people falsely in regard to the Lord’s day, the Christian Sabbath and a day of worship? Incredible!” *SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.4*

For the benefit of those who are not acquainted with the Fathers we will state that all of the epistles credited to Ignatius exist in two forms, the longer and the shorter. It is very evident, even allowing that Ignatius wrote any epistles, that both those forms cannot be correct. And there is no question, even among scholars who endorse Ignatius but that the longer form is a corrupt text. In the above quotation the reader will notice that two statements concerning the Sabbath are credited to Ignatius. When we state, however, that these are the same, both being taken from the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Magnesians, the first from the shorter form, and the longer, the reader will see that it is found necessary to multiply even spurious testimony, in order to uphold the Sunday institution. We might state, moreover, what is the case, that in the original text of this so-called epistle by Ignatius, there is no reference whatever to the “Lord’s day.” But inasmuch as that statement, although a truth, must be taken by the general reader upon our word, we will allow the assumption that the epistle has been correctly translated, and will give argument upon which the reader can judge for himself. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.5*

It will be noted that considerable capital is made of the fact that Ignatius suffered martyrdom for the truth, and that therefore his testimony concerning the Sunday Lord’s day must be valued. Thus Mr. Bailey says: “Did this early martyr and disciple of John, who for thirty-seven years was pastor at Antioch in Syria, a church which had the ministrations of inspired apostles—did he teach the people falsely in regard to the Lord’s day, the Christian sabbath and day of worship? Incredible!” To this question we have two answers:—*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.6*

1. Because a man lived in the days of the apostles, and even in a church which had their inspired ministrations, it adds nothing to the weight of his testimony. Hymeneus and Philetus had the benefit of the labors of the apostle Paul, yet they overthrew the faith of many Christians, by teaching that the resurrection was already passed. *2 Timothy 2:17, 18*. Diotrefes was not only one who loved to have the pre-eminence in the church, but he held a position of influence, since he had power to cast people out of the church; yet he openly rejected the teaching of the apostle John, and cast out of the church those who would receive it. *3 John 9, 10*. Paul said to the elders of the church at Ephesus: “I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.” *Acts 20:29, 30*. From this we know that very early in the history of the Christian church, men who were pastors in the church began to teach heresies; and that the heresies which they taught were not trivial is shown by Peter, who after writing about the giving of the prophecies said: “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as their shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them.” *2 Peter 2:1*. The fact that Ignatius was a bishop, and that to in the first century, would not make his teaching any more to be believed than though he lived in the present day. Nay, more. When that teaching directly contradicted the teaching of the Scripture, it would only make him the more blameworthy. But we need not impeach the

integrity of the Ignatius, for,-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.7*

2. There is no reason to believe that Ignatius of Antioch ever wrote any epistle at all. In support of this assertion we shall make a few quotations. The translators of the so-called Ignatian epistles, in there introductory notice, after stating that there are fifteen of them, say:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.8*

"It is now the universal opinion of critics, that of the first eight of these professedly Ignatian letters are spurious. They bear in themselves indubitable proofs of being the production of a later age than that in which Ignatius lived. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome makes the least reference to them; and they are now by common consent set aside as forgeries, which work at various dates, and to several special purposes, put forth under the name of the celebrated bishop of Antioch.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.9*

"But after the question has been thus simplified, it still remains sufficiently complex. Of the seven epistles which are acknowledged by Eusebius ('Hist. Eccl.' iii. 36), we possess two Greek recensions, a shorter and a longer period. It is plain that one or the other of these exhibits a corrupt text, and scholars have for the most part agreed to accept the shorter form as representing the genuine letters of Ignatius."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.10*

"But although the shorter form of the Ignatian letters had been generally accepted in preference to the longer, there was still a pretty prevalent opinion among scholars that even it could not be regarded as absolutely free from interpolations, or as of undoubted authenticity. Thus said Lardner, in his 'Credibility of the Gospel History' (1743): 'I have carefully compared the two editions, and am very well satisfied, upon that comparison, that the larger are an interpolation of the smaller, and not the smaller an epitome or abridgement of the larger... But whether the smaller themselves are the genuine writings of the Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, is a question that has been much disputed, and has employed the pens of the ablest critics. And whatever positiveness some may have shown on either side, I must own I have found it a very difficult question."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.11*

Mosheim says:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.12*

"A regard for truth requires it to be acknowledged that so considerable a degree of obscurity hangs over the question respecting the authenticity of not only a part, but the whole of the epistle ascribed to Ignatius, as to render it altogether a case of much intricacy and doubt."-*"History of Christianity," cent. 1, sec. 52.SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.13*

Neander says of the so-called epistle of Ignatius: "Even the shorter and more trustworthy addition is very much interpolated."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.14*

Dr. Schaff ("History of the Christian Church," Vol., sec. 119), says:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.15*

"The doctrinal and churchly views of the Ignatian epistles are framed on a peculiar combination, and somewhat materialistic apprehension of John's doctrine of the incarnation, and Paul's idea of the church as the body of Jesus Christ. In the 'Catholic Church'-an expression introduced by him-that is, the episcopal orthodox organization of his day, the author sees, as it were, its continuation of the mystery of the incarnation and the reality of which he outpoured great emphasis against the docetists; and in every bishop a visible representative of Christ, and a personal center of ecclesiastical unity, which he presses home upon his readers with the greatest solicitude, and almost passionate zeal. He thus applies those ideas of the apostles directly to the outward constitution, and makes them subservient to the principle and institution of the growing hierarchy. Here lies the chief importance of these epistles; and in this respect we have found it necessary to distinguish them already in the section on the organization of the church.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.16*

"It is remarkable that the idea of the episcopal hierarchy should be first clearly and boldly brought out, not by the contemporary Roman bishops, Clement, but by a bishop of the Eastern Church; though it was transplanted by him to the soil of Rome, and their sealed by his martyr blood. Equally noticeable is the circumstance that these boldest documents of the hierarchy seven became so interpolate, curtailed, and mutilated by pious fraud, that it is to-day almost impossible to discover with certainty the genuine Ignatius of history under the hyper- and pseudo- Ignatius of tradition."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.17*

Dr. Killen:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.18*

"It is no mean proof of the sagacity of the great Calvin, that, upwards of three hundred years ago he passed a sweeping sentence of condemnation on these Ignatian epistles. At the time many were startled by the boldness of his language, and it was thought that he was somewhat precipitate pronouncing such a decisive judgment. But he saw distinctly, and he therefore spoke fearlessly. There is a far more intimate connection than many are disposed to believe, between sound theology and sound criticism, for a right knowledge of the word of God strengthens the intellectual vision, and assists in the detection of error wherever it may reveal

itself... Calvin knew that an apostolic must have been acquainted with an apostolic doctrine, and he saw that these letters must have been the productions of an age when the pure white of Christianity was really obscured. Hence he denounced them so emphatically; and time has verified his deliverance. His language respecting them has been often quoted, but we feel we cannot more appropriately close our observations on this subject than by another repetition of it. 'There is nothing more abominable than that trash which is in circulation under the name of Ignatius.'"*"Ancient Church." Period 2, sec. 2, chap. 3, par. 12.SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.19*

We might quote much more to the same effect if we had space, but it is not necessary. The argument from Ignatius may be summed up thus: First, the testimony credited to him is in direct contradiction to the Scripture teaching. Second, the whole thing is a forgery. Third, it is quoted twice so as to increase the effect. This is the kind of testimony which is invariably quoted to supplement the so-called argument from Scripture in favor of Sunday. Since it is customary to reserve the strongest argument for the last, this affords a good comment on the strength of the argument from Scripture for Sunday. *W.SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.20*

(To be continued.)

"Something New But Untrue" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

We thought we had heard all the arguments that could by any possibility be brought against the Sabbath; but we have just come across one that to us is absolutely new. This one comes all the way from Texas, and is the joint product of a Methodist minister, a professor in a college, and an "orthodox theologian." We find it in a little pamphlet entitled, "The Sabbath Day Examined." It is our design to give our readers the benefit of everything that is offered against the Sabbath, and so we give this. In deference to the high authority whence the book originates, we do not venture to change the grammatical construction in any particular. The reader will notice from the way the matter is introduced, that it is one of a class of similar arguments:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.21*

"Before leaving this class of arguments, we will introduce one more which is of itself sufficiently strong to preclude the idea of the most sanguine Sabbatarian of going back to creation to begin with number seven for Sabbath. I have before me a little book in which it is stated that an orthodox theologian asked a Sabbatarian, 'From when do you date your Sabbath?' 'From creation, sir,' was the reply. Now if you will just listen to me, I will prove that you do no such thing. Is the Sabbath a moral or religious institution? Nay, has it the elements of good or evil in it? Please answer. Is it good or evil? If either, the observance of it by Adam would have been a violation of the law which God gave to him. 'Of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat.' The same as to say, 'The observance of the Sabbath by Adam before he sinned would have knowledge of good and evil, and of itself a sufficient reason for all the sin and misery that the world has ever known from that day until the present.'"*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.22*

We are not told what reply the Sabbatarian made to the "orthodox theologian" who got off the above. No doubt he was so much overwhelmed by such a torrent of "orthodox" theology and "orthodox" grammar and logic, too, that he could not reply. But we have had time to take breath since we read it, and so we venture to turn the tables on the "orthodox theologian" as follows:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 150.23*

1. Is marriage a moral or religious institution? Nay, has it the elements of good or evil in it? Please answer. Is it good or evil? If either, then the entering into the marriage state by Adam would have been a violation of the law of God, which forbade him to know good or evil. Therefore Adam, according to our orthodox theologian, was not married until after the fall, and was not in the transgression.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.1*

2. Has God the elements of good or evil in him? Is he good or evil? If either, then if Adam had known anything about him before the fall, it would have been a violation of the commandment which God gave to him, that he should know good or evil. But God is good; he is goodness itself; therefore, according to the argument of that "orthodox theologian," we must conclude (a) that Adam did not know God until after the fall; (b) that since he did not know God until after the fall, he never received from God any commandment concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil; and that (c) consequently, Adam never having received any commandment from the Lord, never fell, but continued a clam-like existence, neither good or evil, but half way between both, like Mohammed's coffin suspended between heaven and earth!*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.2*

But someone who has not had the superior advantages of that college professor or the "orthodox theologian," may be simple enough to say, "These conclusions directly contradict the plain statements of the Bible." Of course they do; and so does the conclusion of the "orthodox theologian," in regard to the Sabbath. So also does every "argument" which is fabricated against the Sabbath which God gave to man in Eden, and proclaimed in thunder tones from Sinai. The lofty theories of many an "orthodox theologian" would tumble to

the ground instantly, or, rather, would never be raised, if he should take counsel of the Bible, and should accept its plain statements.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.3*

The tree which was forbidden to Adam was the tree of the knowledge of good *and* evil, and not of the knowledge of good *or* evil. Adam knew good; so long as he regarded the command of the Lord, he could not know anything else, and God did not design that he should; but when he transgressed the Lord's command, he knew evil as well as good. This transgression, which made him evil, brought "death and all our woe," and it also brought into the world a flood of just such absurd, contradictory, unscriptural, and wicked "arguments" as that put forth against the Sabbath by that reputed "orthodox theologian." W.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.4*

"Discrediting Prophecy" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Another time-setter who would be nothing if he were not sensational, has arisen in New York, and declares that the world will come to an end in the year 1900. Of course all his so-called calculations are the most foolish kind of guess-work; for there is absolutely no prophetic period which reaches this side of 1844. But that will not prevent this man from finding followers; he could, however, acquire no notoriety whatever if it were not for the newspapers, some of which are devoting considerable space to notices of his vagaries.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.5*

The more absurd any proposition is, the more widely it is sure to be circulated by the secular press. If it were not for this fact, weather prophets, perihelion theorists, and time-setters, might about as well go out of business. But as this time-setting is a most fruitful source of unbelief, we can scarcely hope that the devil will allow it to slumber; and it behooves those who have received the truth, and who have an understanding of Christ's work in the heavenly sanctuary, to give heed to the words of the Saviour: "Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he will return from the wedding; that, when he cometh and knocketh, they may open to him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.6*

"Unconcealed Infidelity" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

By this term we do not refer to the blasphemous rantings of Ingersoll, but to the infidelity that is preached from Christian pulpits and scattered broadcast by the religious press. This is scarcely a Bible doctrine, or a fact of sacred history that is not positively denied by some professing to be religious teachers. The Bible says that in six days God created the heaven and the earth; but that truth has been so long and so generally denied by religious teachers, that he believes the simple Bible statement, is considered an old fogey. To believe the simple statement of the Bible is considered a mark of ignorance. Our attention has been especially directed to this matter of late by several noted instances of clerical infidelity, a few of which we will notice.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.7*

An English clergyman has recently published to books on "Christ and Christianity," in one of which, entitled "A Picture of Jesus," The following version is given of the miracle at Cana:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.8*

"The Virgin is evidently a little discomposed. The run on the wine is, no doubt, due to the people who came in the retinue of her Son. She cannot bear that members of her own family should put to shame the giver of the feast and so close a friend. "They have no wine, my dear Son—you see there are too many, in consequence of—Hush!" Jesus stops her, with exquisite sensibility and gentle courtesy. He will not have attention called to the fact of there being any deficiency.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.9*

"No doubt Jesus and his disciples had brought wine enough, at least for themselves, *according to custom*. But now, is it not possible—even likely and Christlike—that with loving thoughtfulness, and knowing the extra concourse in consequence of his presence, Jesus may have said to his disciples, 'If we go, we must not be burdensome to our friends; they are not rich; many will follow us; the sacred rights of hospitality, by which at least a season none may be excluded, must not be put to shame; take plenty of wine, and let it be *good—the best wine*. But don't let it be known; we must not do a kindness to get praise by others, at the expense of wounding our host's feelings; let us so manage that, if possible, he may not even know that his wine ran short; let us leave our supply *outside*, it need only be used if called for, and then served up out of the *host's own pots*. The water pots at the door are sure to be empty by that time, it will be most convenient to put our wine in them at the right moment, and no one will be likely to notice that it is not the host's own wine.'*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.10*

"So when the wine 'runs short,' Jesus himself steals away from the feast—the servants quickly get in the wine,

fill up the water pots under his directions-and the whole had been done so quietly that the first thing noticed is that wine is being poured out of pots usually containing water. Some noticed *that*; the *servants*, we are told, knew about it, and could have been the real explanation; but the *ruler* of the feast did not even know that the wine had failed; he only noticed that what was now served was the best wine." *SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.11*

The above was written by one who writes "Rev." before his name; and we have seen it printed in a prominent denominational journal, without a word of dissent. Instead of being called a picture of Jesus, his book should have been entitled "a Caricature of Jesus." For no one who has ever read the simple narrative in the second chapter of John, could believe that the one who wrote the paragraph above had any other motive than to ridicule the Bible account. The evangelist plainly states that the servants, at the command of Jesus, filled the six stone water-pots, and as plainly states that that water was made wine; yet this man professing to give a picture of Jesus, has represented him as using deception in order to perpetrate a very clumsy trick. It is not simply that the miracle is denied, but Jesus is represented as being actually dishonest. No professed infidel ever did more to bring the Bible into disrepute by his coarse jokes upon it, than has this professed minister of the gospel. We cannot believe that a man who presents Jesus in such a light as he does, can have any faith in him or in the Bible. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.12*

In its issue of December 9, the *Christian Union* reprints an article from the *Popular Science Monthly*, which begins thus: "There is no weed weedier or more ubiquitous than the common thistle. In Paradise, it is true, if we may trust John Milton and the Sunday-school books-wise, as usual, beyond what is written-there were no thorns or thistles." The one who wrote that has read the Bible to little purpose, if he has read it at all, or else he doesn't accept the Bible as final authority on any subject. The Bible says that at the close of creation, "God saw everything that he had made, and, behold it was very good." *Genesis 1:31*. Thorns and thistles are not good. Also we are told that "out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food." *Genesis 2:9*. And the growth of thorns and thistles is expressly declared to have been the direct consequence of the sin of our first parents: "And unto Adam he [God] said, Because thou hast harkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it; cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it at all the days of thy life; thorns and thistles shall it bring to thee." *Genesis 3:17, 18*. It would be well if many who nowadays presume to write upon Bible subjects had as much knowledge of the Bible as John Milton had; better still if they believed it as fully as he did. The quotation which implies that thistles grew from the beginning, and were in Eden, is perfectly in keeping with the rapidly-increasing tendency to leave God out of the account altogether, and to hold that the world evolved itself. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.13*

Again, in the *Christian Union* of January 20, the editor, Lyman Abbott, makes an exhibition of infidelity in his comments on the current Sunday school lesson. The lesson is upon the call of Abram, *Genesis 12:1-9*, and is entitled "The Faith of Abram." We make a few quotations from the article: *SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.14*

"And so he went out, 'not knowing, whither he went'; not knowing, I may add, by whom he was led. He went by faith, obedient to the command of that inward sense which is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things unseen. He crossed the Euphrates, passed over the desert and entered the unknown land which he determined should be his home. He pitched his tent and built an altar near to what afterward became Bethel; and initiated his entrance in a new country by a new worship. He called, it is said, upon the name of the gods. In treating this ancient history we are almost wholly in the land of conjecture; the conjecture is reasonable that he first introduced into use, and so into the Hebrew Scriptures, the plural form *Elohim*, the gods, as a method of expressing his faith that the many Lord and gods of the Chaldaic religion were but different names or expressions for the one God who is the Master and Maker of all. As Paul commended the altar to the unknown God, and whom the Athenians unknowingly worshiped proceeded to declare unto them, so Abraham, not attacking even by implication the polytheistic beliefs of his father's house, grouped in thought all the gods of the earth and the heavens together, and took the first step toward a true monotheistic worship by calling on the name of the gods, as though in the many he would recognize but One." *SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.15*

Some persons may in the above a sample of the advanced theology, but we can see only a sample of advanced in fidelity. The Scripture says, "Abraham believed God;" Lyman Abbott says that Abraham was not sure that there was any God. The Scripture tells us the simple facts about the call of Abraham, where he was when he was called, how old he was, where he went, and where he stopped on the way, and the instances connected with his journey; Lyman Abbott says, "in treating this ancient history we are almost wholly in the land of conjecture." We submit that the only room there is for conjecture is by ignoring the Bible narrative. The writer of the above conjectures that because the word "*Elohim*" is used (not however by Abraham, but by Moses, the historian), therefore Abraham had the gods of Chaldea in mind when he built the altar and worshiped at Bethel. He might as reasonably conjecture that Moses had the many gods of the Egyptians in mind when he wrote, "In the beginning God [*Elohim*] created the heavens and the earth." *SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.16*

But the writer continues:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 151.17*

"Of course I am well aware that there are able theological writers who suppose that modern theology was furnished to Adam in Eden, and to Abraham in Ur, and to whom this whole rendering of Abraham's immigration will seem secular, if not profane. To them the plural *Elohim* is an evidence that Abraham believed in the Trinity, and his erection of an altar is conclusive proof that he comprehended the atonement. If religion is something external to man, we may certainly conceive it prepared ready-made and given to him, like the dress of skins which the Lord God made for Adam and Eve in the garden. But if religion is character, if it is what man is, not what he *has*, in the crude and ruder states of human development, religion must be simple and crude in its forces; then, as we are content to teach our children the very simplest truth is concerning God, and their duty toward him, and their right of trust in him, so we not only may, but we must, think God has taught the race."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 152.1*

The trouble is that his theory does not allow that God is the author of religion. In fact, it ignores God entirely. Instead of allowing that God is the teacher of the race, it makes man his own teacher, and religion something that is evolved from his own inner consciousness. If religion is not something external to man, then it is only human and not divine. The Bible says that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God;" but the writer of the above paragraph, in claiming that religion is something that is developed within the individual man, being crude at first, but becoming more perfect as the man becomes better educated, does away entirely with the necessity for a God. His theory is infidelity pure and simple.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 152.2*

To show that this charge is well founded, and that the editor of the *Christian Union* has in his comments entirely ignored God, we make one more quotation:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 152.3*

"So perhaps from this simple story we may get a simple and clear idea of what is that calling and election which has been a theological trouble to so many minds. Abraham was the first in the long line of God's 'chosen people;' and he is himself designated in the Bible as 'called' and 'chosen.' We are called whenever we feel within an inspiration to a higher life or to some special divine action; we make our calling and election sure when we are obedient to the voice divine.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 152.4*

"To listen to and obey this voice is faith. Abraham 'believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness.' Abraham's creed at this time, if I have read his story correctly, must have been of the simplest kind. He could have believed in no Bible, for he had none; in no divine, atoning Saviour, for he had apparently been told of none; there is nothing to indicate that he knew anything about the future state, nor anything more about God than a general conviction that *Elohim* was one, not many. He knew less than the Magi who followed the star. But, like them, he followed. His inward convictions were very few; what they revealed to him was very simple; but he followed them whithersoever they might lead him."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 152.5*

We have in the above at least one direct contradiction of the Bible. Paul says (*Galatians 3:8, 17*) that the Gospel that was preached to Abraham, and that the covenant that God made with him was confirmed in Christ; Lyman Abbott says that Abraham had no belief in a divine atonement, because he had been told of none. But even worse than this is his theory of the call of God, and his comment on the statement that Abraham believed God. This call, we are told, was simply inward inspiration; and his faith was simply obedience to the promptings of his own heart.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 152.6*

The Bible says that "Abraham believed God and it was accounted unto him for righteousness;" but we are told that what he believed was simply an impulse from within; therefore we must conclude if we except Dr. Abbott's theory, that the God that Abraham worshiped was himself; and that his faith being counted to him for righteousness was simply his own self-approval! This is the doctrine of Spiritualists and infidels. We never picked up a Spiritualist paper that does not counsel its readers to follow the promptings of their own heart. If following one's inward convictions wherever they may lead him, with no regard for a supernatural revelation, were what is meant by faith, then there would be multitudes of people upon the earth who could truly claim to be children of faithful Abraham. But that is not faith; nothing is safe except obedience to the plainly expressed will of God.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 152.7*

It is a matter of very little importance what any single individual believes. We have no controversy with Lyman Abbott. If he wishes to believe that the Bible is a myth, he has that privilege, but we cannot help feeling terribly indignant when we think that such stuff as we have quoted is sent out to tens of thousands of Sunday-school scholars, many of whom will accept it as legitimate comment upon the Scripture. It is a terrible pity that honest students of the Bible cannot be allowed to receive the pure and unadulterated word of God.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 152.8*

The blindness and infidelity concerning the Scriptures that we find among men in high position, is simply appalling. Yet people will say, "If the seventh day and not the first is the Sabbath, why have not these learned ministers of the gospel found it out and preached it?" We reply, If the Bible is the inspired word of God, why

have not these men found it out and why do they not preach it, instead of teaching their own gain imagination? When a man can pervert simple Bible and history as has been done in the quotations we have made, it is not surprising that he cannot see a scriptural duty which interferes with his convenience. And yet these men, not withstanding their unconcealed infidelity, will be blindly followed by thousands. *W. SITI March 10, 1887, page 152.9*

"The Lord's Prayer. Thy Kingdom Come" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

"THY KINGDOM COME"

In this brief petition is contained one of the most comprehensive requests ever made by mortal man. Thousands have repeated the simple phrase thoughtlessly, and thousands who have pronounced the words with all the reverence possible for them, have had very limited ideas of what they were asking for. Someone has well written:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 154.1*

"Thy kingdom come;" thus day by day
We lift our hands to God, and pray;
But who has ever duly weighed
The meaning of those words he said?" *SITI March 10, 1887, page 154.2*

Let us try to weigh the meaning of the words, that we may utter them more intelligently. It is certain that if we know the full meaning of the petition, we shall not lightly make use of it. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 154.3*

First, we will notice that the Lord's prayer shows the kingdom to be still future. That prayer is for all Christians; it is a model for us, just as much as it was for the personal followers of Christ. We are to pray for the kingdom of God to come; but that would be out of place if the kingdom were already set up. That it was not set up in the days of Christ's first advent, is shown by the question which his disciples asked as they stood upon the Mount of Olives, just before he was taken out of their sight. Said they, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" *Acts 1:6*. Christ did not say, It has already been restored, but "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power." That is, It is not for the disciples to know when the kingdom will come; but they are to pray for it; if they knew that the time for the kingdom were fixed, it would be useless to pray for it. That God has not made known the time of the coming kingdom, is shown by the statement that he has put it "in his own power." He is not under obligations to set up the kingdom at any specified time, for he has not appointed any; it is all within his own power. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 154.4*

Many people have the idea that "the kingdom of Christ and of God" is a spiritual kingdom, that it is simply the reign of the Spirit in the hearts of believers. It is true that the gospel plan is termed a kingdom, as in *Colossians 1:13* and *Revelation 1:9*; but that kingdom,-the kingdom of grace,-begun as soon as man fell, as soon as he had need of "the grace of God which bringeth salvation;" but the kingdom referred to in the Lord's prayer is, as we have seen, still future; consequently that kingdom cannot be the gospel. Moreover, the apostle James says: "Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?" *James 2:5*. Here he speaks of a kingdom that is *promised* to those who love the Lord,-a kingdom of which they are *heirs* through faith. It is this kingdom for whose coming we are to pray. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.1*

WHAT THE KINGDOM IS

When Adam was created, he was made king of the earth, as is shown by these words: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." *Genesis 1:27, 28*. This dominion was forfeited by the fall, and the world passed into the hands of the one who had conquered Adam,-Satan,-who is now "god of this world." Not that God has no control over the earth; for even when he gave the dominion to Adam, he did not relinquish any part of his own universal dominion; but Satan took as much of the dominion as was given to Adam. He is not able, however, to go beyond the bounds which God sets for him. See *Job 1:12, 26*. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.2*

When David was king over Israel, God promised him that his throne should be "established forever." *2 Samuel 7:16*. This promise was often repeated, and God said, "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful

witness in heaven." *Psalm 89:34-37*. Yet notwithstanding this promise, it was not long before the whole kingdom of Israel was overthrown, and the people were taken into captivity; and although many of the people were afterward allowed to return to their own land, the kingdom was never restored. The kings who afterward reigned in Jerusalem were simply the creatures of the Roman power, which controlled Judea and all the rest of the civilized world. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.3*

But David himself, it seems, never expected that his throne should be established forever with earthly monarchs upon it. He understood that Christ was the one referred to, who should rule over the kingdom. So Peter, after quoting David's words in *Psalm 16:8-10*, said: "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulcher is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell the grave, neither his flesh did see corruption." *Acts 2:29-31. SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.4*

Christ, then, is the one who is to "restore again the kingdom to Israel." It is to be a literal kingdom for he is to sit upon the throne of David. When the angel Gabriel announced to Mary that she should be the mother of Jesus, he said: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." *Luke 1:32, 33*. The coming kingdom must, therefore be as literal a kingdom as was that of David. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.5*

The kingdom is, however, to be different, in that it will be perfect and sinless. Said the prophet, addressing Christ by inspiration; "And thou, O tower of the flock, the strong hold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion; the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem." *Micah 4:8*. And the Lord himself, in his promise to David, said: "Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in the place of their own, and move no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more." *2 Samuel 7:10. SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.6*

These two texts teach us that the dominion of Christ is to be the same as that given to Adam, "the first dominion," that it will be the earth in its Eden beauty and freedom from the oppression of sin. And so we read the words of Peter, who, after speaking of the fire which shall melt the earth, and shall destroy sin and sinners out of it, says, "Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." *2 Peter 3:13*. This promise is recorded in *Isaiah 65:17-25*. Read those verses, and then read the parallel passage in *Amos 9:13-15*. Then read *Amos 9:11, 12*, and you will see that this new heavens and new earth is in the time when the Lord has restored the kingdom to Israel. So we learn that when we pray, "Thy kingdom come," we are simply praying for God to set up his own reign of righteousness in the earth made new. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.7*

SETTING UP OF THE KINGDOM

But let not the subject be dismissed with this simple statement of the truth. Around the fulfillment of this promise cluster the grandest and most tremendously important events. That kingdom is ushered in by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, as Paul indicates in his charge to Timothy: "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead... his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word." *2 Timothy 4:1, 2*. This kingdom Christ receives before he returns to earth; for he himself compared himself and kingdom to a certain nobleman that "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." *Luke 19:11, 12*. See the account of his receiving this kingdom, in *Daniel 7:13, 14*. So it is, that when Christ comes in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, he will be sitting upon the throne of his glory, and to the righteous he will say: "Come, ye blessed of my father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." *Matthew 25:31-34*. This again shows that the kingdom which the saints are to inherit is the dominion of the earth. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.8*

In this kingdom righteousness, and that alone shall dwell. *2 Peter 3:13*. The prophet says of that time: "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." *Isaiah 60:21*. Read the verses preceding this one, and then read the twenty-first chapter of Revelation, the last verse of which says: "And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." *SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.9*

This state of righteousness will not be brought about by the conversion of all men, for we read that as the end approaches "iniquity shall abound" (*Matthew 25:12*) and that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse" (*2 Timothy 3:13*); and that in the days when the Son of man shall be revealed, it shall be as it was in the days of Noah and of Lot. *Matthew 24:37-39; Luke 17:26-30*. So when God gives to Christ the heathen for this inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth, for a possession, the first thing he does is to rule them

with a rod of iron and dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. See *Psalm 2:8, 9*. Says the prophet: "Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it." *Isaiah 13:9*. And we also read that when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven with his mighty angels, it will be "in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." *2 Thessalonians 1:7-10*. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.10*

Thus we learn that to pray, "Thy kingdom come," is to pray for the coming of the Lord to destroy the wicked, and to cleanse the earth of everything that defiles, and to give immortality to his people. God is no respecter of persons. Whosoever shall not be found written in the book of life shall be cast into the lake of fire. *Revelation 20:15*. It will avail nothing that men have said, Lord, Lord,-that they have prayed earnestly, even praying for the kingdom of God to come, if in that day any defilement is found in them, they will be cast into the lake of fire. Who is there, then, that realizing what the kingdom of God is, who alone can inherit it, and what will be the fate of those who are unfit,-can pray, "Thy kingdom come," and still cherish sin in his heart? How carefully and unblamably we must live if we are able to unite, in saying, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." *W. SITI March 10, 1887, page 155.11*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

Bradstreet's says that the grand total of wages sacrificed by strikes since January 1, is \$3,000,000. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.1*

In this session of Congress, which is just closed, appropriations for coast and naval defenses have been made to the following amounts: Steel for ordnance and armor, and a gun factory, \$8,000,000; coast fortifications, \$5,000,000; ordnance for naval purposes, \$8,000,000; ten steel cruisers, \$21,800,000; floating batteries for Coast defense, and torpedoes, \$15,000,000. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.2*

Elder J. M. Reese, president of the Tennessee Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, writes us from Nashville that he has good prospect of success in securing the passage of a bill which will relieve Sabbath-keepers of the persecution to which they are subject because of the present unjust Sunday law. We believe that the bill will pass at this time, and that those in Tennessee who keep the commandments, will yet have a little season for unmolested work. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.3*

Immediately after the Sunday law meeting of which we gave a brief review in the SIGNS last week, we published a somewhat extended review of the main points considered, under the heading, "The Sunday law.-An Address to Thinking People." In the address we quoted Senator Crocketts speech as it appeared in the SIGNS last week. This little document was gotten out principally for circulation here in Oakland, where the meeting was held; but friends of the truth and other places have called for it, so that although it has been printed less than two weeks, more than thirty thousand copies have been distributed. Thus the matter of the Sunday law is being agitated. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.4*

"Is its right for a Seventh-day Adventist, who is the owner of a house, to let it for a grocery store where liquors are sold and cards are played in open day? V. S. N." *SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.5*

A person undoubtedly does wrong to let a building with the knowledge that it will be used for immoral purposes, such as our questioner describes; but if the person hiring the building gave the order to understand that it was to be used for legitimate business purposes, and after getting possession went to selling liquor, the owner cannot be held responsible for the deception, neither has the power over the building until the time expires for which the building was rented. Then of course the owner can and should refuse to let his house any longer for such purposes. We would add, also, that liquor-selling and card-playing are no worse in open day than under cover of darkness. *SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.6*

Two weeks ago, in a note with the heading, "A Sign of the Times," we quoted an indorsement of Catholicism, by the late Dr. Hodge, of Princeton. In the *Independent* of February 17, 1887, we find the following editorial utterance, which confirms our statement that Protestantism is fast turning Catholic. It is this: *SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.7*

"Our readers well know that we have our eyes open to see the good in the Roman Catholic Church, and that we welcome it as an ally against atheism in religion, and socialism in the State. The religion of Catholicism is that of the Bible, and considerable more; but it is a religion of God and the Bible." *SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.8*

After such an utterance, the statement that there is no fear that Catholicism will become a controlling factor in this country, is only an evidence of the blindness of the writer. If Protestants accept and welcome the Catholic Church as an ally, they may rest assured that they will have the controlling influence; for Rome never enters into an alliance as second to any other power. In this country, the power that controls may not be *called* Catholic, but whatever the name, the thing will be the same. Protestantism which has repudiated the principles of the Reformation will be no better than Catholicism.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.9*

The hope that was expressed by some that the Dr. McGlynn affair in New York would result in a considerable defection among Catholics in that city, has proved to be vain. The rebellious priest has refused to go to Rome, but he has not, and probably will not, be excommunicated for his disobedience. And now we are told that the Pope has sent him his blessing, and that the Doctor was very much pleased and affected to be thus noticed by "his holiness." All of which indicates very clearly that McGlynn will not withdraw from the communion of "the church." If he did, it is by no means certain that he could take with him a single follower. About the only way to rescue a Roman Catholic from the chains of error which the Papacy has cast about him, is to get him converted; and that is not accomplished by partisan fends or socialistic theories. Those who expect to see the Catholic Church, even in a single city, wrecked upon such a rock as the McGlynn trouble, read history and prophecy to very little purpose.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.10*

An error which is clung to most persistently by a great many people, is that the coming of the Lord will overtake all "as a thief in the night." It is true that the apostle does say (1 *Thessalonians* 5:2) "that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night;" but he immediately adds (*verse* 4): "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief. Ye are all the children of light, and the children of the days; we are not of the night, nor of darkness." So it is only those were in darkness that will be overtaken as a thief; and of them the apostle says (*verse* 3), that "sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.11*

In his description of the recent revival in Boston, the Rev. M. C. Ayers says:*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.12*

"At any meeting one might see silk hats and silk dresses in close contact with homespun and overalls; and the wearers of the different grades of apparel manifested absolute consciousness of equality in the one great fact that they were sinners, and thus they were heartily ashamed of their sins."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.13*

"The rich and poor meet together; the Lord is the maker of them all." *Proverbs* 22:2. The rich are no better than the poor, and there is no reason why they should not meet on common ground, when they are common sinners. But if they are simply "*ashamed* of their sins," they will not long keep on that common ground. The frequent use of similar expressions of late, in connection with great revivals, convinces us that we need not hope for any real religious awakening. The man who has no deeper feeling than shame for his sins, and either covers them up and hides them from even his own sight, or he may become lost to shame for them. When Michael stands up, and "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," some of them will awake to shame, and everlasting contempt; all those only who have felt godly sorrow for sin, because they have violated God's holy law, will awake to everlasting life. Genuine revivals are always connected with something else than shame because of the meanness.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.14*

The *Interior* tells of a Protestant lady who "not long since called upon her pastor, and said she had attended worship in a Catholic cathedral, and wished to say that she was favorably impressed. The priest, in his discourse, had quoted a text of Scripture, and he did it in a way to convey the impression that he was quoting final authority-the truth, having been found in Scripture, was indisputable. That, she thought, was the secret of the priest's power over the people. He did not doubt, and therefore they did not."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.15*

Of course we are not to understand that Catholics as a rule follow the Bible any more closely than do Protestants, but upon this occasion when the priest did refer to the Scripture his manner was such as to impress this woman, who was evidently not accustomed to hearing texts of Scripture quoted as "final authority." The principal business of many of the pulpits of to-day is to "explain away" the plain words of Scripture, and to tone down the more plain and cutting truths, so that they may not be offensive to "ears polite." The *Interior* well says: "Making apologies for the Bible is about the weakest and poorest talk a man can indulge in."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.16*

While reading the article from the *Christian Union*, extracts from which are made in the article in this number of the SIGNS, entitled "unconcealed infidelity," one thought forced itself upon our mind. It was, Why is the Bible used at all by those who so utterly ignore its plain statements? When a writer will take the simple narrative that of the call of Abraham, and will say that in dealing with the subject he is almost wholly in the field of conjecture, and will then add, out of his own fancy, things directly subversive of the Bible narrative, we cannot see why he might not as well make up an entire story, and comment upon that. Indeed it would be far

better, for then those who want the original Bible could have it unadulterated by theological fancy, and those who want the conjectural Bible could take it. But this will not be done; no man could get up anything that would compete with the Bible, and they would soon lose their prestige; so they keep close enough to the Bible to lean upon it when their imagination fails,-close enough to seduce our unthinking people into the unconscious infidelity.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.17*

In a late number of the *Occident*, there is a good, homely article by "Rusticus," about hearing. The closing paragraphs speak of so crying an evil of this time, and contain so much wholesome truth in relation to it, that we give them here:-*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.18*

"There are a great many new things in this world and a great many true things. But it must not be taken for granted that all the new things are true things, and that all the true things are new things. There is a good deal of old-fashion truth-of truth that will never become obsolete. This truth is like daily bread. It is revealed for the permanent nourishment of our souls. We eat it with our ears. And if we refuse to seek it, and prefer unhealthy condiments and stimulants, we must expect to be feeble in faith.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.19*

"If any of my readers are troubled with itching years, I advise them to go at once to the Great Physician and ask him to heal them. I have known the disease to prove fatal in some cases. I do not believe that anyone who is afflicted with it can be happy in the Lord. But alas, in these days it is a fearful epidemic. There are whole churches that suffer from it, and yet don't seem to know why they have no revivals of religion."*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.20*

At the National Conference of Charities and Correction, Governor Hoadly of Ohio, related the following, the truth of which he vouched for, having himself inspected the letter referred to: "There is in a certain governor's office, I shall not say where, the letter press, books, and correspondence of a certain governor, I shall not say who. A friend sought from this governor the pardon of two criminals. The governor gave his correspondent the choice, but refused to pardon both, because, as he said, that county's quota was exhausted! This was no joke, but the reason seriously given by an earnest governor who distributed pardons by geography." Such a travesty on justice needs no comment; we note it as a sign of the times.*SITI March 10, 1887, page 160.21*

March 17, 1887

"The Law and the Gospel" The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

The law of the Father and the gospel of the Son are not antagonistic elements. Instead of the former being superseded by the latter, it is honored, magnified, and established by it. The plan of salvation was devised not to abolish the law, but that God "might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." *SITI March 17, 1887, page 163.1*

We know that man is a moral being, under the domain of law and directly responsible to his Creator for all his acts. John tells us that in prophetic vision he "saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." And again, we are told that "every one of us shall give account of himself to God." Nor are we left in any uncertainty as to the standard of the judgment to which we are all hastening; the wise man says: "Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." While the master himself said to the young man, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." *SITI March 17, 1887, page 163.2*

But "who then can be saved?" How can any escape death, the wages of sin, "for all have sinned"? And because of what the law says every mouth is stopped and all the world is guilty before God. The question is answered in those matchless words of our Saviour: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And with Paul every humble, trusting soul may exclaim, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." And this because there is "no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit." "For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; *that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.*" *2 Corinthians 5:21*. Or, as the apostle expresses it elsewhere, God sent his "Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin [margin, "by a sacrifice for sin"], condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." And all this agrees perfectly with the words of our Saviour: *SITI March 17, 1887, page 163.3*

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven [Campbell's translation, "of no esteem in the sight of Heaven"]; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." *Matthew 5:17-19. SITI March 17, 1887, page 163.4*

But let every soul that has named the name of Christ remember "that no flesh should glory in his [God] presence. But of them are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." "For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." *1 Corinthians 1:29-31; Philippians 2:13. SITI March 17, 1887, page 163.5*

"A Weighty and Timely Utterance." (Continued.) The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

THE FATHERS AND THE EARLY CHURCH

Justin Martyr is next quoted as follows: *SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.1*

"On Sunday we all assemble in common, since that is the first day which God, and on the same day of our savior Jesus Christ rose from the dead." *SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.2*

This is an incorrect quotation, inasmuch as it makes Justin speak of the resurrection of Christ as a reason for worshiping on Sunday, when he made no mention of that event. What he really says is this: *SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.3*

"And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gathered together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits." *First Apology of*

Justin, chap. 6.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.4*

This is a minor difference, but it serves to show how even the trashy stuff which the so-called Fathers wrote is garbled in order to bolster up the Sunday. But it may be said that we have here evidence in favor of Sunday observance, since Justin really says that they met on the day called Sunday. To that we reply that we shall not attempt to deny that Sunday was observed to some extent at quite an early period, but the fact that a thing was done, is no evidence it ought to have been done. Within three hundred years after the crucifixion of Christ we can find every abomination of the Papacy in the Christian church. In the preface to the "Ancient Church" Dr. Killen says:-*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.5*

"In the interval between the days of the apostles and the conversion of Constantine, the Christian commonwealth changed its aspect. The bishop of Rome-a personage unknown to the writers of the New Testament-meanwhile rose into prominence, and at length took precedence of all other churchmen. Rites and ceremonies, of which neither Paul nor Peter ever heard, crept silently into use, and then claimed the rank of divine institutions. Officers for whom the primitive disciples could have found no place, and titles, which to them would have been altogether unintelligible, began to challenge attention, and to be named apostolic."*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.6*

Justin then was a Greek who lived in the second century; and concerning the condition of the church in that century has the following:-*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.7*

"Among the Greeks and the people of the East nothing was held more sacred than what were called the Mysteries. This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to say that they also had similar mysteries, or certain holy rites concealed from vulgar; and they not only applied the *terms* used in the pagan mysteries to the Christian institutions, particularly baptism and the Lord's Supper; but they gradually introduced also the *rites* which were designated by those terms. This practice originated in the eastern provinces; and thence, after the times of Adrian (who first introduced the Grecian mysteries among the Latins), it spread among the Christians of the West. A large part, therefore, of the Christian observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of the pagan mysteries."-*Ecclesiastical History, book 1, chap. 4, sections 1-5.SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.8*

If antiquity were to be allowed as evidence of the correctness of the practice, nearly all error would be classed as truth. The question with the us is not what people have done, but what ought they to have done, and the Bible alone can answer the question satisfactorily.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.9*

The next "evidence" that is brought to the support of Sunday is the following:-*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.10*

"Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, about the year 162 says: 'Both custom and reason challenge from us that we should honor the *Lord's day*, seeing on that day it was that our Lord Jesus completed his resurrection from the dead.' (Edwards's Manual, p. 114.)"*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.11*

It may strike the reader as strange that these testimonies are quoted from Dr. Edwards's "Sabbath Manual," and not directly from the Fathers themselves. But this means the responsibility for any wrong quotation is all thrown upon Dr. Edwards's. On this quotation from Theophilus, all that we have to say is that *it is entirely manufactured*. Not a line of it appears in his writings. He does not use the term "Lord's day," and nowhere even mentions the first day of the week. It is evident that Dr. Edwards, who is primarily responsible for this forged testimony, was no novice in the use of the Fathers, and did not stand in need of any instructions from the Rev. Philetus Dobbs. We will say this, however, for the forged testimony from Theophilus, that it is just as good evidence for Sunday-keeping as any that can be found in any of the Fathers; and it is entitled to just as much weight as though Theophilus had actually written it. But the advocates of Sunday have the lack of testimony in its support, and the next quotation given is "equally conclusive" with that from Theophilus. Dr. Bailey says:-*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.12*

"Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons in France, and the disciple of Polycarp, in the year 167, says that the Lord's day was the Christian Sabbath. 'On the Lord's day everyone of us Christians keep the Sabbath, meditating on the law and rejoicing in the works of God.' (Edwards's Manual, p. 114.)"*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.13*

Of the lesson we have simply to say that the term "Lord's day" nowhere occurs in the writings of Irenaeus. Our readers, though, have doubtless found out by this time that even if one of the Fathers did not happen to speak about a certain thing, it does not in the least invalidate the testimony quoted from him in favor of it. If he had only realized what straits the advocates of Sunday would be in for argument in the nineteenth century, he might possibly have said what they want him to say, and so it is just the same as though he had said it. This seems to be the plan adopted by those who quote the Fathers.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.14*

There is one little thing about the writings of Irenaeus which we never remember to have seen quoted, and

while we are on this subject we will mention it here, that our readers may see the straightforwardness of the Fathers in general, and of Irenaeus in a particular area. In the introductory notice of the writings of Irenaeus, we find the following statement by the translators:-*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.15*

"The great works of Irenaeus, and now for the first time translated into English, is unfortunately no longer extant in the original. It has come down to us only in an ancient version, with the exception of the greater part of the first book, which has been preserved in the original Greek, through means of copious quotations made by Hippolytus and Epiphanius. The text both Latin and Greek, is often most uncertain. Only three MSS. of the work 'Against Heresies' are at present known to exist. Others, however, were used in the earliest printed editions put forth by Erasmus. And as these codices or more ancient than any available, it is greatly to be regretted that they have disappeared or perished. One of our difficulties throughout, has been to fix the readings we should adopt, especially in the first book. Varieties of reading, actual or conjectural, have been noted only when some point of special importance seemed to be involved.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.16*

"After the text has been settled, according to the best judgment which can be formed, the work of translation remains; and that is, in this case, a matter of no small difficulty. Irenaeus even in the original Greek, is often a very obscure writer. At times he expresses himself with remarkable clearness and terseness; but, upon the whole, his style is very involved and prolix. And the Latin version adds to these difficulties of the original, by being itself of the most barbarous character. In fact, it is often necessary to make a conjectural re-translation of it into Greek, in order to obtain some inkling of what the author wrote. Dodwell supposes this Latin version to have been made about the end of the fourth century; but as Tertullian seems to have used it, we must rather place it in the beginning of the third. Its author is unknown, but he was certainly little qualified for this task. We have endeavored to give as close and accurate a translation of the work as possible, but there are not a few passages in which a guess can only be made as to the probable meaning."*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.17*

This assurance must be a great comfort to those who dote on Irenaeus. It must be a great satisfaction to his admirers to know that they have his exact language just as clearly as can be *guessed at* by people living 1,000 years after he died. The plan adopted by the translators is very much like trying to arrive at an exact amount of a certain sum of money by guessing at half of this and multiplying that by two. And this is a specimen of the volume of all the writings of the so-called Fathers. Many of them are wholly forged, and the others have been altered and interpolated and garbled so that the ones who wrote them would not recognize them, if they were alive. As Dr. Mosheim says, it is of no importance that much of the writings of the Fathers has been lost, since they are utterly unreliable. We do not know that they are ever quoted except in support of a cause which cannot be sustained by the Bible. They are simply blind leaders of the blind. To go to them for light on the Bible is like taking the shades of midnight to illuminate the face of the sun.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.18*

We have followed Dr. Bailey thus far in his proofs from the Fathers, not because we thought it necessary to try to refute the so-called argument, but that our readers might see clearly the broken reed upon which the Sunday institution rests for support. We think enough has been said to demonstrate this point, and we will not follow it any further.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.19*

Dr. Bailey says: "How silly and shallow is a falsehood that Constantine changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. "So we say; and we have never heard of a Sabbath keeper who was foolish enough to make such a claim. There was no man who could change the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week as Doctor Scott says, the truth is that the change was made gradually. All deviations from the right are made in the same way. But it is true that the change from the seventh to the first day was made by "the man of sin," "that Wicked," the mystery of whose iniquity was working even in the days of the apostles; and it was just such perversions of truth as this that made the Papacy the "mystery of iniquity," "the abomination of desolation."*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.20*

But while Constantine did not change the Sabbath, he did have a hand in perpetuating the wicked change that had already been made, and in establishing the Papacy on a firm basis. "Chambers's Encyclopedia," speaking of the custom of the early church, says:-*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.21*

"Whatever may have been the opinion or practice of the early Christians in regard to the cessation from labor on the Sunday, unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the sabbatical observance of that date is known to have been ordained, is the edict of Constantine 321 A.D."*SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.22*

We have seen this statement denied by those who asserted that Christ and the apostles changed the Sabbath, but we have never known anyone to quote a commandment for Sunday-keeping earlier than that of Constantine. It is very easy to say that Christ changed the Sabbath, but it is impossible to find a commandment to that effect. *W.SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.23*

(Concluded next week.)

"Why We Keep the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

In reply to a request in the SIGNS for someone to send one direct Bible text showing Sunday to be the Sabbath, the gentleman writes: "I do not propose to discuss the subject, for I am not sufficiently versed; but, Yankee-like, I can turn the question by asking you the same in regard to Saturday. Please give chapter and verse to sustain you in Sabbath or Saturday worship." *SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.24*

This we are very happy to do. "And God said all these words, saying.... Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all the work; but this seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt if not to do any work, thou, nor thy daughter, the manservant nor maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor a stranger that is within guide takes; for in his six days of the Lord made heaven and earth and the sea at all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; where for the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." *Exodus 20:1, 8-11*. This is correct, simple, easily understood, and comes direct from Heaven. It is the foundation of all Sabbath observance. It is sufficient of itself. And the Bible contains abundance of corroborative testimony, but not a word for first-day observance. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 166.25*

"Saturday or Sunday" The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

This is the title of a fourth-page leaflet having a subtitle, "A letter to Seventh-day believers." It was written by Mrs. J. C. Bateham, "Supt. Sabbath Observance Department, N. W. C. T." We give it a place in the SIGNS in compliance with the request which accompanied it, to "please publish." The letter is as follows:- *SITI March 17, 1887, page 167.1*

DEAR CHRISTIAN FRIENDS: Many of you I know and love as conscientious Christian workers in our Women's Christian Temperance Union and elsewhere, and greatly respect your self sacrificing devotion to principle. I desire your earnest cooperation in efforts to save a weekly Sabbath for our beloved country, that without it must sink to heathenism and ruin. One your own writers, N. V. Hull says: "By common consent, the weekly Sabbath is a necessary institution. It is in the interest of both civilization and religion, and the world without it would be in darkness and confusion. The loss of a Sabbath would be irreparable." Yet to-day, so strong is the tide of Sabbath desecration, so determined, and successful the opposition from the liquor traffic and other Sabbath foes, that apparently only the united and earnest efforts of Christians can preserve it. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 167.2*

Surely no Christian should be found on the side of its enemies. Would that we might see eye to eye on the question that divides us, for it is a simple one: *Does the Sabbath day of the Bible necessarily fall on Saturday?* We think not. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 167.3*

In Eden, God set apart and blessed a day, not the seventh of time, but the seventh day, as the Holy Sabbath, we claim that no man can possibly tell on what day of the week that first Sabbath fell, since their names are not revealed. God's days were doubtless long ages-*aeons*, during six of which the creation was finished, so that all earthly time is a part of Gods Sabbath in which he rests from creative work. The Sabbath was instituted after Eve was created. Time is reckoned from Adam's first day, but how much of that sixth *aeon* Adam had lived before Eve's creation, there is no record. His creation was apparently toward the close, yet he lived single long enough to make the acquaintance of every living thing and give to each a name expressive of its peculiarities, and to find that not one was a suitable companion. Then he slept and Eve was created. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 167.4*

The next day was the Sabbath. It was Eve's first day, not seventh. Who shall tell how many days or weeks of Adam had lived? If the particular day on which that Sabbath fell was important, God surely would have made it plain. The fair inference is that the particular day is immaterial. God worked in six of his days, then rested one. Man too was to labor six days then rest one. First-day Christians as literally follow Genesis as do seventh-day believers, not accepting the hour of beginning the day, for our revised version says simply of each day, "there was evening and there was morning." These days being *aeons* the phrase is figurative. A day's work is ended, a rest as of night follows. Then with the light a new day begins. Nature's division of time was followed. The phrase is not repeated for the seventh day, since the morning of *verse 21, 31* is the dawning of the seventh, showing this sixth complete. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 167.5*

Later in Israelitish history, the observance of Sabbath was apparently and of necessity lost during the 400 years of bitter Egyptian bondage among a people who measure time by tens instead of sevens; and Moses

apparently re-instituted it by God's commandment, at the exodus on the day that just one week previous had been used for a long march by God's command. *Exodus 14*. Perhaps God designed thus to show that the particular day was immaterial. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.1*

The fourth commandment at Sinai again enjoins the holy keeping of the seventh day as Sabbath, without telling on what day by name that seventh day fell, and as it had been changed once and may have been changed, or lost, at other times before or after the flood, we can only infer that God commands a day-a whole day-kept holy, and this day itself follows six of work, and thus be the seventh day. The Jewish nation as such had its beginning at the exodus, when God re-instituted the Sabbath and on a new day partly in memory of their birth as a nation. *Deuteronomy 5:15. SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.2*

The Eden Sabbath was for all mankind to the end of time. Day not known. The Jews since the exodus, so far as we know, have observed Saturday as their Sabbath. Christian nations observe Sunday. When was the change made? No one knows positively, nor is it at all important, as we believe. Had it been of consequence we should have definite information. Proof is abundant that Sunday was observed long before Emperor Constantine, and before the papal church had a beginning, with strong evidence that during the first few centuries both Saturday and Sunday were observed by believers, presumptive evidence that the change must have required high if not the highest authority, and to my mind satisfactory proof of apostolic usage. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.3*

Again, we know it is a geographical impossibility for persons living in different parts of the world to observe the same hour as a holy time. There is a gradual change extending over twenty-four hours, till on the adjacent Alaskan islands the Sunday of one is a Saturday of the other. Which, if either, is the Sabbath of Eden or the exodus, who can tell? More than nine-tenths of the Christian world insist that it is contrary to the spirit of Christianity to be thus bound by the letter (the Jewish usage of the seventh day) when every requirement of the Eden Sabbath for the fourth commandment is as fully met by those who keep their seventh day on Sunday as Saturday. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.4*

The tendency of all Christian growth is toward dropping nonessential and toward fellowship. The essentials to salvation are the atonement, repentance, and faith. The form of baptism or church and government, or the day we celebrate, is certainly not essential to salvation. Success in saving souls and doing Christ's work, shows God's hearty co-operation with all. Let us be like-minded. "That they all may be one," is our Saviour's prayer, if not all Baptists or Methodists, but one in love and devotion. To this end, agreement in essentials-charity in non-essentials. Is there hope that Saturday will be generally adopted as the Christian Sabbath? Apparently not. Then if the day is a nonessential, but the *Sabbath* of vast importance, there should be hearty co-operation to secure it. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.5*

But you say, How can we support Sabbath laws that oppress us? Exceptions should be made for certain classes. It should be sufficient defense to a prosecution for servile labor the first day of the week, that "the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as a holy time and does not labor upon that day, and that the labor complained of was done in such manner as not to interrupt or disturb other people in observing the first day of the week as a day of rest and religious worship. "With this exception for our present laws are, if well enforced, usually satisfactory. In some States they need revision. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.6*

Law cannot control of religious belief or give us a religious Sabbath. It should give us a civil Sabbath, that is, a non-legal one, wherein governmental and public business shall be suspended, and all labor and recreation so far suspended as not to interfere with the enjoyment of a religious Sabbath off by those who wish it. This is all we ask and less would not protect the Sabbath. Such a law would be burdensome to those who have already abstained from labor one day, but could not violate their conscience, and with the above proviso the burden would be light as possible. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.7*

This burden we ask you to bear from love to God and religion and from motives of patriotism. The irreligious with false notions of personal liberty, object to having their rights infringed upon on any day of the week, but we answer, law must consult the greatest good of the greatest number, and the same rule applies to us all. If we cannot see alike, let us credit each other with candor, honesty, and a desire to obey the Lord of the Sabbath, and may none of us be found shrinking from any self-denial by which we may help preserve the Sabbath, and thus help save a world that Christ loved even unto death. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.8*

COMMENTS ON THE ABOVE

The sum of the above letter is this: Nine-tenths of the Christian world insists that it is wrong to rest upon the seventh day of the week, therefore those who believe that it is right so to do ought to throw aside their conscientious convictions and join with the nine-tenths of the Christian world in forcing the non-Christian world to adopt a certain form of religion. The appeal for help from the seventh-day observers is based on the attempted argument to show that Saturday is not the Sabbath, and therefore we will briefly notice the

positions taken by Mrs. Bateham.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.9*

1. The claim is made that in Eden God set apart and blessed the Sabbath day, which was no day in particular. Says the writer:-*SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.10*

"God's days were doubtless long ages, during six of which the creation was finished, so that all earthly time is a part of God's Sabbath, in which he rests from creative work."*SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.11*

The word "doubtless" means, "without doubt or question; unquestionable." A thing that is so well established that there is no chance for question in regard to it, must be able to present a long array of positive proof. We look around for the proof that the days of creation were long ages, but we find none at all. All that we have ever heard offered is the vain imaginations of skeptical devotees of science falsely so-called, who ignore the agency of an almighty God in creation, and assert that it is impossible that the world should have been created in six literal days. The great body of professed Christians, fearing lest they should be thought ignorant of the "latest deductions of modern science," have hastened to accept this baseless theory of infidel geologists and evolutionists, forgetting that by so doing they were either limiting the power of God, or else ignoring him as Creator. The idea that the world was formed during long ages of time, is a modern device gotten up expressly for the purpose of avoiding the necessity of admitting the power of God. To be sure, some who hold to this theory admit that God had something to do with creation, that is, that he started it, and that after he had brought protoplasm into existence, the rest of the work did itself. But the logical result of the whole theory is to deny that God had anything to do with the creation of the world.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.12*

One thing is certain, and that is, that it is no greater tax of faith to believe that God created the world in six literal days, than to suppose that he took six thousand or six million years. The Bible says that in six days God created the heaven and the earth, and we believe it. The first chapter of Genesis informs us plainly what kind of days these days were. They were days composed of an evening and a morning, that is, a dark part and a light part. This succession of light and darkness is caused only by the revolution of the earth on its axis. Those who hold to the *aeon* theory, would confer a favor by telling us what there is besides the revolution of the earth on its axis which causes the succession of light and darkness on the earth, and also how much of each long period was dark and how much was light. Moreover, those days were such days as the sun and moon were made to rule over. See *Genesis 1:14-19*. Will Mrs. Bateham kindly inform us whether the sun and moon here referred to are the same bodies with which we are so familiar? And if they are, how does it happen that now they rule over days of just twenty-four hours' length, instead of long periods of time?*SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.13*

We are told that "all earthly time is a part of God's Sabbath in which he rests from creative work? That is to say, that the present time is God's Sabbath-day. Let us see how well this agrees with the Scripture. In *Genesis 2:2, 3* we read that God rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made, and that God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, "because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." This brings to view a Sabbath rest completed before the blessing was pronounced upon it. God blessed the seventh day because that in it he had rested. This simple statement of the Bible brushes away all the speculations of men, as an elephant would brush away a cobweb from his path. When the Bible says that God's rest upon the seventh day was in the past, and that he blessed it and sanctified it because he had rested, we care nothing for the human conjecture that God's Sabbath-day is all earthly time.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.14*

Once more, the fourth commandment refers to the work of creation as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis, and repeats the statements found in *Genesis 2:2, 3*. There we learn that we are commanded to rest upon the seventh day because God did so. To sanctify means "to appoint," as in *Joel 1:14*. And thus we understand the fourth commandment and *Genesis 2:3* to read that God blessed the seventh day and appointed it for man's observance, because that in it he had rested from all his work. And this allows no other conclusion but that the seventh day which man is commanded to observe, is of the same length as that upon which God rested.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.15*

It seems that Mrs. Bateham is a little confused in her own mind as to this matter, for in the same paragraph in which she says that all earthly time is a part of God's Sabbath, she also says, "We claim that no man can possibly tell on what day of the week "the whole period of earthly time" falls. The less cannot include the greater; and if "the whole period of earthly time" should fall on one day of the week, it would crush it to almost as attenuated proportions as Mrs. Bateham's Sabbath argument. She says also that time is reckoned from Adam's first day, but of how much of that sixth *aeon* Adam had lived before Eve's creation, there is no record. Then she says: "The next day was the Sabbath; it was Eve's first day, not seventh day." She has already told us that that Sabbath-day is all earthly time, yet she says, "If the particular day upon which that Sabbath fell is important, God would surely have made it plain." So we have two views offered us: One is that Adam and Eve died sometime in that seventh day, and that Adam did not live 930 years, but only a part of two days; also that

Eve was created and died within the compass of that seventh day, but her last day. And then coming down to the literal reckoning of time, we are told that the seventh day was Eve's first day. Thus it is implied that each individual must begin to reckon time for the observance of the Sabbath from the day following his birth. And yet we are requested to join in a movement compelling all people to rest on Sunday, because it is claimed that that is the true Sabbath day. Does Mrs. Bateham believe that everyone was born on Saturday? *SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.16*

THE SABBATH NOT LOST

2. Then we are told that the observance of the Sabbath was of necessity lost during the Egyptian bondage, because the Egyptians measured their time by tens instead of by sevens. That is as much as to say that if nine-tenths of the people should reckon their time by tens it would be impossible for the other tenth to reckon by sevens. There is not the slightest evidence that the Sabbath was ever lost. It is very probable, however, that the Jews were compelled to labor on the Sabbath during a part, at least, of their Egyptian bondage; but God delivered them from that bondage in order that they might keep his Sabbath; and even allowing that they had lost all knowledge of the day, they certainly had full knowledge of it after God made it known to them in the wilderness. Moses did not re-enact the Sabbath, but he himself said, "See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath." *Exodus 16:29*. Mrs. Bateham says that "Moses apparently re-instituted it by God's command, at the exodus on the day that just one week previous had been used for a long march by God's command. *Exodus 14*." It is quite evident to our mind that Mrs. Bateham has not studied the Sabbath question very extensively; for *Exodus 14* says nothing about any long march made by the Israelites, except their passage of the Red Sea, which was made in the night, and it says nothing about the Sabbath; neither does that chapter nor any other say anything about the Sabbath being re-instituted by Moses. With these three exceptions, her statement is correct. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 168.17*

Mrs. Bateham says that although the fourth commandment enjoins the keeping of the seventh day as the Sabbath, we cannot tell when it comes, because that day is not mentioned by name; and that "it had been changed once, and must have been changed or lost at other times before or after the flood;" and that consequently "we can only infer," etc. What a delightfully indefinite foundation she has laid upon which to build and enforce the observance of a definite Sunday. But the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is the same as that of creation; so it was not changed, and although the Sabbath "might have been lost," we know full well that it never was lost. It was kept constantly before the Israelites. Dire calamities were threatened them in case they should neglect its observance, and they were finally carried into captivity as a punishment for breaking the Sabbath. No one who believes in the justice of God can claim that he would punish his people for neglecting to observe a day which had been lost. After the Babylonian captivity the Jews never again relapsed into idolatry, and when Christ came he recognized the day which they were observing as the Sabbath. Mrs. Bateham herself allows that the Sabbath has not been lost since that time, because she makes a claim for uninterrupted Sunday observance from that time to this. And so we are sure that the seventh day which we observe is the day which God sanctified in Eden. Neither is it true that when the seventh day was set apart it was not named. God said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." That is the name,—"seventh day." *SITI March 17, 1887, page 169.1*

SUNDAY AND THE "MAN OF SIN"

3. A feeble attempt is made to rescue Sunday from its papal parentage, the only argument against its being a Papal institution being that it was observed before the Emperor Constantine, and before the Catholic Church had a beginning. The same argument would prove that purgatory, prayers for the dead, and the sign of the cross, are not Papal institutions, because they were in the Christian church long before the time of Constantine. The fact that Sunday was observed from a comparatively early period, is no more evidence of divine authority for it, than is the fact that the sign of the cross was practiced by Christians in the second century, and that images were worshiped by Christians as early as the third century, any evidence that the apostles enjoined these ceremonies. It may not take much evidence to satisfy Mrs. Bateham, but if she wishes to convince seventh-day believers that Sunday is the Sabbath, she will have to give direct and positive statements of Scripture and not "presumptive evidence." In a matter of this kind, we dare not presume. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 169.2*

But we will leave the Sabbath argument and notice briefly the plea for a civil law. On this we will say first, that Sunday legislation has not the slightest connection with the temperance cause, even though the Women's Christian Temperance Union has gone aside from its legitimate work to form a "Sabbath Observance Department." A man may observe Sunday strictly and be an intemperate man still. He may be a strict temperance man and not regard any day as the Sabbath. Sunday legislation is in the interest of Sunday alone, and not of temperance. Those who observe the seventh day of the week are uniformly temperance people, but they do not believe that shutting up liquor saloons one day in the week would make any diminution of the cursed liquor traffic. Whenever it is proposed to submit to the people a constitutional amendment

entirely prohibiting the sale of liquor, we promise that seventh-day observers will, to a man, work with them. We believe it is a crime to sell intoxicating liquors, and we would have it prohibited just as the promiscuous sale of other poisons is prohibited. And if it is only in the interests of temperance that Sunday legislation is asked for, then entire prohibition would secure that end.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 169.3*

Second. It is idle to talk of the enforcement of Sunday as a civil institution. Sunday, although not a divine institution, is a religious institution. Its religious character was given to it by human authority; nevertheless, since it was appointed by "the church," it is primarily and wholly a religious institution. Now under whatever pretext Sunday observance is enforced, it will be a fact that the State is enforcing the observance of a religious custom. The day cannot be separated from its churchly connection any more than a man can be separated from his character. So that to ask us to unite with them in securing laws in favor of Sunday, is simply asking us to help make laws to enforce the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, when it has no shadow of claim to be regarded as the Sabbath.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 169.4*

Third. Sunday legislation is not Sabbath legislation. We believe in working for the upbuilding of the Sabbath, but we cannot do it by working for Sunday. It does not matter if the majority do regard Sunday as the Sabbath, that does not make it the Sabbath. As well might the Chinese say to the few missionaries who are in that empire, "There is no hope that Jehovah will ever be generally accepted in this empire as God, then why not join with us in enforcing the worship of Joss, that thus we may work together in unison for the universal worship of deity?" The missionaries would just say, "There is no God but one, and it is not enough that people should worship some being, but if they would offer true worship they must recognize God who made the heaven and the earth." They would readily recognize the fact that they would not be working in the interest of morality if they should attempt simply to secure the worship of some deity whom the majority would recognize, and not worship God. And so we say if we should engage with our sisters of the National Temperance Union in attempting to secure Sunday laws, we should not be working for the Sabbath.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 169.5*

It is not enough to be told that we will be allowed to rest upon the seventh day; the question is, Would we be allowed our God-given privilege of laboring on the first day? The answer is that they would allow us to work a little. They purpose to make the burden upon us "as light as possible." This in itself is an admission that they know that the enforcement of a Sunday law will work injustice to some. Now the law is not simply for the greatest good to the greatest number, but it is for equal justice to all. A law that works injustice to a single individual is an unjust law. A law that cannot be observed by every individual of the commonwealth, without someone being deprived of the privileges which God allows him to enjoy, has no business to be enacted.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 169.6*

We are willing to give Mrs. Bateham and all her sisters of the Temperance Union, credit for honesty of purpose. We are willing to grant that as an association they would not desire to see a single individual oppressed for the observance of the seventh day. But no matter how kind their intentions may be, when their law is once enacted, their power over it ceases. Then the most bigoted and benighted individual in the country has the power to secure its enforcement, and while they would not wish to injure anyone who observes the Sabbath of the Lord, and might wish to enforce it simply upon non-professors, they could not hinder the bigot from securing its enforcement upon all, thus making it a means of wreaking his spite upon those who differ with him in religious belief.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 169.7*

More than this, we would not work with them for the enactment of a Sunday law, if we could have a bond given by them collectively and individually, assuring us that they would not only grant us immunity from punishment for laboring on Sunday, but would secure us against all possible molestation. The reason why is this: Sunday is not the Sabbath; it has no claim to be so regarded; the seventh day (Saturday) is the Sabbath of the Lord; God has given a solemn and emphatic command that it should be kept; and we regard it as our imperative duty to enlighten people concerning the nature and obligation of the Sabbath. Now if we should join in a movement to secure the civil recognition of Sunday, we should be only nullifying our efforts to induce men to regard the seventh day and that only as the Sabbath. It would be an agreement on our part to assist in forging chains for others, providing we could be allowed to go free, and would be an announcement to the world that while we ourselves purposed to keep the seventh day, we did not regard it as necessary that other people should do so. But we do regard it as of vital importance to keep the seventh day according to the commandment of God, and although but few may listen to the teaching of the Bible on this subject, that does not absolve us from our duty to teach the truth, not alone by our words, but by our acts.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 169.8*

We repeat: We are willing and even anxious to join in any purely temperance work, but even the so-called "Sabbath Observance Department of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union" cannot make us believe that Sunday is the Sabbath, nor beguile us into working for a Sunday law under the guise of temperance. "Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird." *Proverbs 1:17. W.SITI March 17, 1887, page 169.9*

E. J. Waggoner

Our friends who are so zealous for the civil Sunday Law, tell us that the law ought to be enacted to meet the minds of the majority. How would they like it if they were in China, and a law should be enacted compelling all men to pay homage to heathen gods? They would speedily complain of the intolerance of laws of China. But if their theory of the rights of majorities is correct in one place it must be correct everywhere; and therefore heathen countries actually ought to compel all people within their jurisdiction to worship heathen gods! In Turkey a law enforcing Mohammedanism would meet the minds of the majority, and so, according to the reasoning of our Sunday friends, such laws ought, of right, to prevail in Turkey. But no; they would not suit them. They don't believe in the rule of the majority unless they form part of the majority.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.1*

At the last session of the California Methodist Episcopal Conference, the establishment of a "summer school of theology" was recommended, and a committee was appointed to carry out the design. This committee has received the co-operation of the University of the Pacific, and the school will be held from May 23 to June 2. In their prospectus a committee say that "the numerous theological vagaries afloat, and the misleading tendency of some literature on the subject, emanating from respectable sources, render this a favorable opportunity to restate and emphasize the great doctrines of our common Christianity, as held by the Methodist Episcopal Church. "We have seen of late so many vague and contradictory theories put forth by prominent members of the Methodist Church, that we shall be glad to have an authoritative declaration of just what that church does believe. And we are anxious to see how far they will indorse the position of Wesley and Fletcher on the law of God."*SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.2*

Mrs. Bateham says that the day that is observed as the Sabbath is one of the non-essentials. If that is so, we should like to know why she and her brethren and sisters of the National Reform Party are making such frantic efforts to have the observance of Sunday established by law. If they believe the particular day to be observed is a matter of no importance, why don't they let people do as they please in the matter. We can see in the movement nothing but a stubborn purpose on the part of the leaders to compel everybody to do just as they do. Because with them it is not a matter of *conscience*, but only of *will*, they are determined to believe that it is not a matter of conscience with others; or that if it is with any a matter of conscience, the conscience of the minority must submit to the will of the majority. Thus it was in the days of the Inquisition; and then, as now, all was done in the name of the Lord, and for his glory.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.3*

Under the heading of "Satanic Omnipresence," the *Golden Gate* attempts to ridicule our statement of the true theory of spiritual phenomena, by saying that there are thousands of persons being influenced at the same time, in different phases of mediumship, and that if there is a personal devil "he must be in thousands of places at once in the same instant of time; hence he must be omnipresent. There is no escaping this conclusion."*SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.4*

Those who are familiar with the Bible will readily see that there is no chance for any such conclusion. Says the Revelator, when speaking of the phenomenon of spiritualism: "They are the spirits of *devils*, working miracles." *Revelation 16:14*. These devils are "the angels that sinned," and that "kept not their first estate;" and their name is "legion," for they "are many." *Mark 5:9-13*.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.5*

In our reference to Spiritualism we write with no great expectation that those who have been ensnared by it will see their error, although there is hope even that those who had been taken captive by the devil of and his will, may be recovered from his snare (*2 Timothy 2:25, 26*); but we write for the purpose of putting the unwary on their guard against this most novel and dangerous delusion of the arch-enemy of mankind. The Bible, and the Bible alone, forewarns and forearms us against it.*SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.6*

E. J. Waggoner

"As a madman who casteth firebrands, arrows, and death, so is the man that deceiveth his neighbor, and saith, Am not I in sport?" *Proverbs 26:18, 19*. This applies to children as well as to men, and it has special application at the present day. We do not know whether or not the custom of perpetrating "April fool jokes" was in vogue in the days of Solomon; but if it was not, there were people who told lies in sport, and against all such this language is directed. What are called "April fool jokes" are nothing else but lies, and the one who indulges in them proclaims himself a fool. We have seen people professing confidence, who countenance their children in such practices, in doubtless thinking that it was "innocence sport." If a madman should come into a crowded assembly and begin to scatter firebrands, and shoot poisonous arrows, it would not be called innocent sport; but Solomon says he is just like one who deceives his neighbor, and says, "Am not I in

sport?" *SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.7*

The first of April is just before us, and we write this in hope that the eyes of some thoughtless ones may be open to see that a lie on the first day of April is just as sinful as one on any other day of the year; and that to tell a lie in sport is worse if possible than telling one in anger, because it indicates that the person's moral sensibilities are so blunted that he can deliberately lie without having a thought of its sinfulness. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.8*

"Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor; for we are members one of another." *Ephesians 4:25*. Let parents see that they themselves are not blameworthy in this matter, and let them beware lest their children acquire, in sport, a disregard for truth, which will be difficult to overcome. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.9*

"Sabbath Observance by Law" The Signs of the Times, 13, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

A friend in San Francisco, who has read with interest our appeal on the Sunday Law, writes to us:-*SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.10*

"The seventh day being the day that God *did* command to be kept holy, what are the objections to making it the universal day of rest?" *SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.11*

We reply that there are no objections at all, provided all people are willing to regarded it as a day of rest. On the contrary, it ought by all means to be universally regarded as the day of rest, because God has said, "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy works; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work;" and this commandment is addressed to all the inhabitants of the earth. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.12*

But, sad to say, all people do not regard the word of the Lord as of final authority, and they ignore his commandment for a way of their own devising. Someone will say, "Then why not pass a law compelling people to obey the commandment of the Lord?" That would not solve the difficulty, for it would be forced service, and there would be in it no love for God, nor regard for his word. So that if we once started out on the *legal plan*, we should have to pass another law compelling men to love the Lord! But though such a law might be passed, it would amount to nothing, for love is not love unless it comes spontaneously from the heart. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.13*

The obvious conclusion is that the keeping of the Sabbath is purely an act of religious worship of God, and is not within human jurisdiction. God wants all men to repent and come to the knowledge of the truth; and he has commissioned men as ambassadors to beg their fellow-men to be reconciled to God; but he has given no one the authority to attempt the impossibility of forcing men to repent. So he wants all men to acknowledge him, and to show their homage by keeping his Sabbath; and he has committed to men the preaching of the word; but he has given no one authority to try to compel men hypocritically to acknowledge him by a *form* of service. It would indeed be a glorious thing if all men would obey the Lord; but all will not. Our duty is simply to obey him for ourselves, and to use our influence to persuade others to do likewise. Those who will not obey are answerable alone to God, from whom they will at the Judgment receive the punishment which their rebellion merits. *SITI March 17, 1887, page 176.14*

March 24, 1887

"Object of the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago the Rev. F. N. Zabriskie, D. D., wrote a series of articles for the *Congregationalist*, on "The Bible the Workingmen's Book," in one of which he said:-*SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.1*

"The fourth commandment was a law in behalf of workingmen, that they should not be deprived of a weekly rest. The Mosaic law of the Sabbath is often misrepresented, and is apt to be misunderstood by those for whom it is specially intended. The Sabbath as our Lord Jesus Christ said, 'was made for man,' and being a day of rest, it was, of course, pre-eminently made for the workingman. The essential object which the commandment seeks is rest from unnecessary labor."*SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.2*

This is an idea which is fast gaining ground, and which cannot be too strongly combated. It is the prevalence of this idea which gives a great impetus to the movement in favor of a Sunday law. Because of this idea, many irreligious persons will vote for a law enforcing Sunday observance, when they would not do so if it were set before them on a purely religious basis. Of course the result is the same, no matter what motives prompt those who work for the law. Sunday being essentially an institution of the church, if observance of it is enforced by civil law we shall have to that extent a union of Church and State, even though infidels may have voted for the law. The idea that God's design in appointing a day of rest for man was simply for the wants of the physical nature, is a modern device gotten up by the zealous adherents of Sunday observance, with the design of accomplishing a two-fold purpose with respect to the Sunday. If this theory be accepted, its first result is to make men think that the particular day of the week which shall be observed is of no importance, and that the only object is uniformity for the sake of convenience. And the second result is the enforcement of Sunday, the day which has the most adherents, on the basis that the State has a right to legislate for the physical well-being of its citizens.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.3*

The Sabbath was made for man; not for one man simply but for all mankind. The fourth commandment was a law in behalf of the workingmen, only in the sense that God designed that all men should be workingmen. It is true that the Sabbath rest furnishes opportunity for the repair of physical waste, so that man is better able to perform the duties of the week following. But this is incidental; we cannot say that it is even a secondary reason for the giving of the fourth commandment, because it does not enter into the matter at all. The keeping of the Sabbath is primarily an act of worship. The Sabbath was given as a memorial of God's creative power. It was given that man might ever keep in mind the one true God, whose distinguishing characteristic is that he created the heavens and the earth. It was given to guard men against idolatry; for those who keep the Sabbath according to God's appointment, and for the reason for which he appointed it, can never worship false gods. Every man will worship the object which to him seems greatest. Some men think there is nothing greater in creation than themselves, and so they worship themselves. They are called atheists, because the god that they worship is so insignificant that they are considered as not recognizing any God. But the man whose mind is drawn out to meditate upon the wonders of creation, and who realizes that the things that are made reveal the existence of the one only true God, will never worship any inferior being. The Sabbath was appointed for the express purpose of giving man an opportunity to meditate upon God and his works, and thus to keep alive the sentiment of real religion. Those keeping the Sabbath have the first principle of worship to God. The man who thinks that it was given for the purpose of securing proper physical rest to man, has no just conception of the nature of the Sabbath.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.4*

But since the Sabbath was appointed by the Creator, that man might recognize him as Creator, and since it is purely a matter of worship and of recognition of the true God, it follows as a matter of course that the rest must be upon the particular day which God has designated as the Sabbath. Otherwise God is in reality ignored. Worship implies submission. Submission is indicated by obedience. When a man refuses to obey another, it is because he considers himself equal to, or superior to that other, and of course there would be no thought in his mind of worshiping such an one. So if men really worship God, they will submit to his will in all respects. If they wilfully disobey him, they show that their worship is only a form, and that they think more of themselves than they do of him.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.5*

The Sabbath, as we have shown, is the most simple and direct act of worship to God, and since God has specified the seventh day as the Sabbath, it follows that the keeping of any other day as the Sabbath, is not an act of worship to God. It was the seventh day alone upon which God rested from his work of creation. The seventh day alone was blest by him because he had rested upon it, and it was the seventh day and no other, which God appointed for man's observance, with the design that as God upon that day had viewed all his works and pronounced them very good, so man should upon that day consider the works of God and should glorify the Creator. W.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.6*

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

Dr. Bailey closes up his Sunday argument thus:-*SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.7*

“I present but one additional argument; and this I address to those who read the Greek language. If we translate literally the Greek Testament in all four of the evangelists, when speaking of the resurrection of Christ, it would show that a new order of Sabbaths began at that time. In *Matthew 28:1* it reads literally, ‘In the end of Sabbaths as it began to dawn towards the first of Sabbaths, came Mary Magdalene.’ The word *Sabbath* is *sabbatoon*, genitive plural, with no article preceding; so it is in *end of Sabbaths*; and the word translated *week* is also *sabbatoon*, genitive plural with no article. It reads *eis mian sabbatoon*, towards the first of Sabbaths, as if the old order of Sabbaths had passed away, and a new order of Sabbaths had begun. In *Mark 16:1* it reads literally, ‘And when the Sabbath (singular number) was past, Mary Magdalene,’ etc. *Versé 2*, ‘Now upon the first of Sabbaths they came to the sepulcher.’ The same transition is here marked from the old to the new Sabbaths. In *Luke 24:1* it reads: ‘Now upon the first of Sabbath, very early in the morning they came unto the sepulcher.’ Luke uses the article, *the first of the Sabbaths*, but his language, like that of Matthew and Mark, indicates a new order of things. *John 20:1* reads, literally: ‘The first of the Sabbaths cometh Mary Magdalene while it was yet dark unto the sepulcher.’” *SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.8*

The only mistake in the above, from the Sunday point of view, is in addressing the “argument” to those who read the Greek language. The writer evidently gave it for the effect it would have on those who know nothing of the Greek, for no one who has even a little knowledge of that language would be deceived by statements so palpably absurd. The translation of the passages to which he refers is literally exact in the Authorized Version, and no one having a reputation as a scholar to maintain, would dare attempt to translate them differently. We dislike to refer to the Greek, when writing for the general reader, because those who do not read that language have not the power to verify what we say. But we must notice this perversion of the Scripture, and will try to do it in such a way as to be understood by all. It is true that in *Matthew 28:1*; *Mark 16:2*; *Luke 24:1* and *John 20:1*, the word rendered “week” is *sabbaton*. On this word Dr. Robinson, who by the way was a Baptist, in his *Lexicon of the New Testament* said:-*SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.9*

“Meton., a sabbath, put for the interval ‘from Sabbath to Sabbath;’ hence a *se’unight, week*; so especially *Luke 18:12, nesteuo dis tou sabbatou*. Elsewhere only after numerals marking the days of the week; *Mark 16:9, prote (hemera) sabbatou*. Plur., *Matthew 28:1, 1, 19; Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 16:2*.-So Heb. *shabbathoth, Scpt., hebdomadas, Leviticus 23:15. Comp. Deuteronomy 16:9; also the Syriac version Luke 18:12*. In the Talmudists the days of the week are written, *chadh beshabboth, sheni besh, shelisha besh*; i.e., the first, second, third day in the Sabbath (week). See Lightfoot *Hor. Heb. in Matthew 28:1*.” *SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.10*

The reader will notice that Dr. Robinson refers to several other texts where the same word occurs, and where it is properly rendered “week.” Let us try Mr. Bailey’s translation on these passages. Take *Luke 18:12*: “I fast twice in the week; I give tithes of all I possess.” The word rendered “week” is *sabbaton*. Dr. Bailey would translate the passage “I fast twice in the Sabbath,” and would explain it that the Pharisee was priding himself because he fasted twice every Sunday! *SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.11*

Mr. Bailey claims that in the texts to which he refers, the word *sabbaton* should be rendered “Sabbath,” so as to read, “the first of Sabbaths,” thus indicating, he says, that “the old order of Sabbaths had passed away and a new order of Sabbaths had begun.” But in *Acts 20:7* we have the same expression again, in the narration of an event which took place thirty years after the crucifixion. Was this the first of a new order of Sabbaths? If so, what order was it? Mr. Bailey’s rendering would make a new order of Sabbaths to begin at the resurrection, and another order thirty years after, when Paul was at Troas. Still further, the same expression occurs in *1 Corinthians 16:2*, where Paul directs the brethren to lay aside money “on the first day of the week.” Mr. Bailey’s rendering of the passage would make Paul direct the churches to lay by them in store on the first of every new order of Sabbaths! Unless a new order of Sabbaths was instituted frequently, their liberality would not be greatly taxed. It might be noted further that Mr. Bailey in his rendering of the expression entirely ignores the word *hemera* (day), which occurs in the text. But it is unnecessary to carry this point further, for anyone can see from the texts cited the absurdity of his so-called argument. Mr. Bailey himself seems to have enough knowledge of the Greek to have some sense of the absurdity of his own position, for he concludes:-*SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.12*

“Thus there is wonderful agreement of the four evangelists in using this singular expression. It seems to me to convey the idea of a grand change from one order of Sabbaths on the seventh day of the week, to another and new order of Sabbaths on the first day of the week. That such a change then and there actually occurred,

I have abundantly shown from various other proofs, even if these passages be not literally translated as suggested above." *SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.13*

Said the Irish barrister: "May it please the Court, if I am wrong on this point I have another that is equally conclusive." In all Sunday argument the idea seems to be that a good many weak points will make one strong one; that although a dozen statements may be individually fallacious, they will when combined make a true one. That is on the principle that if you add enough ciphers together you will get something of value. The three lines of argument which Mr. Bailey gives from Scripture, from history, and from the Fathers, remind us of the plea in the famous kettle suit. The man who was charged with breaking his neighbor's kettle, made his defense under three heads, thus: "First, the kettle was cracked when I borrowed it. Second, it was whole when I carried it back. Thus, I never borrowed it." If one of these points was disproved, he had two others to fall back on. It made no difference if they did contradict each other, it was proof. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.14*

We have now followed Mr. Bailey through all the windings of his "weighty and timely utterance" in behalf of Sunday. We have done it not with any desire to depreciate Mr. Bailey, but in order to show the inherent weakness of the Sunday cause. We have no doubt that he did the best he could, and that his utterances are just as weighty as any that could be made. In contrast with the vain attempts to put the first day in the place of the seventh as the Sabbath, we present the simple argument for the true Sabbath in the following words: *SITI March 24, 1887, page 182.15*

"And God spake all these words," saying, "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." *Exodus 20:1, 8-11. SITI March 24, 1887, page 183.1*

"The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." *Psalms 111:7, 8. SITI March 24, 1887, page 183.2*

"And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." *Luke 16:17. W. SITI March 24, 1887, page 183.3*

"The Seventh Day of the Week" The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Bible Banner* a man who is attempting to *settle* the Sabbath question, says: "This fourth commandment, in itself, says nothing about the 'day of the week,' any more than it does of the month or year." Very well, let us suppose that it refers to the year. Then the words, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," would mean that we are to work six days of the year, and rest on the seventh. That would give us only one Sabbath in the year, which might be very agreeable to some; but it would also give us only six days in the year for work! What about the remaining three hundred and fifty-eight days? On them, according to the year theory, no one can either work or rest! We think no one will be foolish enough to deliberately take the position that "the seventh day" of the fourth commandment means the seventh day of the year. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 183.4*

Well, then, let us suppose that the commandment refers to the month. Thus "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," would mean that work may be done six days in the month, but that the seventh day of the month is the Sabbath, when no work may be done. In this case we should have twelve Sabbaths in the year, and seventy-two days for work. Many people would be hard pressed to know how to earn a living in those seventy-two days; but they would be much more troubled to know how to employ the remaining two hundred and eighty-one days of the year, in which they could neither work nor rest. We believe that no one, even of those who most hate the Sabbath, will claim that "the seventh day" of the fourth commandment applies to the month any more than to the year. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 183.5*

Well, it must refer to something. Certainly; it applies to a period of time which consists of exactly seven days, six of which are to be used for labor, and the seventh for rest. Now the only period of seven days that is known to man, is the week, and this division of time has been known from the most ancient times. "Seven days make one week," is one of the first things learned by the school-boy. Therefore when the Lord said, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," it is evident that he meant that we may work six days in the week, but that we must rest on the seventh day of the week. And the child of ten years who should profess ignorance of the fact that

the first day of the week is Sunday, and that the seventh or last day of the week is Saturday, would be regarded in this age of schools and schoolmasters as a much neglected youth. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 183.6*

One stock argument of our Sunday friends is that it is very essential that all people should keep the same day, so that there may be no clashing. No one will deny this. Certainly people ought all to keep the same day. And if this is so, it is very evident that God knew it when he gave the commandment. Then he must have commanded all the people to keep the same day. As a matter of fact, all the Jews did regard the same day as the Sabbath. No one will deny this. All will admit that when the Lord gave the commandment, he expected all to whom it was spoken to keep the same day. Then the commandment must refer to a definite day, and to one which all understood. That is, all must have understood "the seventh day" to refer to some specific day; for if they had had the idea that the Lord meant simply that they could rest on any day after six days of labor, and that there was no specific point from which to begin their count, there would have been no uniformity. But there was uniformity among those who regarded the commandment, because the commandment is definite. Two things being granted, the third must follow. Let it be granted that uniformity in the day of rest is essential, and that God knew this when he gave the commandment, and it must be admitted that the fourth commandment specifies a definite day as the Sabbath, and that that day is the seventh day of the week. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 183.7*

So we find that the fourth commandment does in itself tell what day of the week is the Sabbath. For corroborative proof, we turn to the account of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection. He was crucified on the preparation day, "and the Sabbath drew on." *Luke 23:54*. And the women who followed, and saw where he was laid, "returned, and prepared spices and ointment; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." *Verse 56*. That means that they did exactly as the commandment enjoins. Now the next day after that Sabbath day which they kept "according to the commandment," was "the first day of the week" (*Luke 24:1*) and on it they resumed their work. Now since there are but seven days in the week, it inevitably follows that "the Sabbath day" which the fourth commandment enjoins is the seventh day of the week. No man on earth can prove anything to the contrary; and no sane man would think of denying so plain a conclusion, if it were not that he wished to turn aside from the simple commandment of the Lord, for a way of his own choosing. *W. SITI March 24, 1887, page 183.8*

"The Lord's Prayer. Thy Will Be Done" The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

It is probable that this part of the Lord's prayer is the least understood of any. The sentence, "thy will be done," is thought by most people to be applicable only in cases of sickness or other trial, to indicate that the sufferer is willing to endure patiently. But this is but a very limited view of the expression. As a matter of fact there is no more comprehensive sentence in the Bible, or that can be uttered by man, than the simple words, "thy will be done." It all depends on what the will of the Lord is, which point we must investigate. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 186.1*

The second chapter of Romans has reference especially to the Jews, to show that they, as well as the Gentiles, are sinners, and in *verses 17, 18* the apostle speaks to them directly, in these words: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest [his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." How does Paul say the Jew knew the will of God? Because he was instructed out of the law. The obvious conclusion, then, is that the will of God may be known only by a study of the law, which makes necessary the further conclusion that the law of God is his will. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 186.2*

This conclusion is verified most plainly by the words which the psalmist utters prophetically in behalf of Christ. In *Psalms 40:7, 8*, we read: "Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." It is first stated that Christ delighted to do the will of the Father; and then to make this statement emphatic, it is added, "Yea, thy law is within my heart." Out of the heart are the issues of life (*Proverbs 4:23*); as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he (*Proverbs 23:7*); that is, a man's actions correspond to that which is in his heart; he does just what is in his heart. Therefore if the law of God being in a man's heart, leads him to delight to do the will of God, it follows that the law of God is the will of God. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 186.3*

In *Revelation 22:14* we read that they who keep the commandments shall have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city; and in *Matthew 7:21* we read that only those who do the will of God, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven. Here again we see the identity of the will of God and the commandments. If there is any doubt in anyone's mind as to what law it is that is the will of God, it may be settled by reading *Romans 2:21, 22* in connection with *verses 17-20*, the first two of which have been quoted. The ten commandments are the will of God. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 186.4*

Therefore when we pray, "Thy will be done," we in reality pray that the commandments of God may be kept by us and by all others who dwell on the earth. We pray that they may be kept even as they are kept in Heaven, where the angels "do his commandment, hearkening unto the voice of his word." *Psalms 103:20*. It follows, therefore, that whoever utters the Lord's prayer or a prayer modeled after it, and does not in his heart "consent unto the law that it is good," and honestly desires to conform to all its requirements, is guilty of mockery before God. Such an one cannot hope to have his petition regarded; and so we may understand the words of the psalmist: "If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me" (*Psalms 66:18*); and of Solomon: "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." *Proverbs 28:9*. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 186.5*

When will this petition be granted? When shall the will of God be done in earth as it is now done in Heaven? The preceding clause, upon which we commented in our last article, answers this question. It is when the kingdom of God is established upon the earth; for in the new heavens and the new earth, righteousness alone shall dwell. *2 Peter 3:13*. "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever." *Isaiah 60:21*. The law of God, his holy will, is righteousness (*Psalms 119:172*), and the keeping of it constitutes the righteousness of God's people. *Deuteronomy 6:25*. The Lord's prayer, therefore teaches us to long for the coming and kingdom of our Lord, when the law of God shall be in the hearts of all men, even as it was in the heart of the Son of God when he was on earth. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 186.6*

But the coming of the Lord, and the establishment of his kingdom, will not bring about this state of things. When Christ comes, the only change which is wrought in men is the change from mortality to immortality. He does not change men's characters from sinfulness to righteousness, for just before he comes the decree goes forth: "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." *Revelation 22:11*. Men will be ushered into eternity with just the same characters that they have when probation closes. Those who inhabit the new earth will all be righteous, simply because the transgressors will have been rooted out of it (*Proverbs 2:22*), and the perfect will be permitted to remain in it, just because they are perfect in the midst of unrighteousness, even as Noah was. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 186.7*

This being the case, it follows that to utter the Lord's prayer with honesty of heart, is to pray that God will work in us that which is good; it indicates a willingness to submit ourselves in all things to the will of God, that we may become like him. Certainly no one who knows what the will of God is, and who knows how it will come to pass that the will of God shall be done on earth as it is in Heaven, could utter that prayer and not really desire to have that law written in his heart. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 186.8*

Although God's ways are as much higher than our ways as the heavens are higher than the earth, we have the assurance that every petition offered in humility and sincerity will be answered, and as we may attain to this high standard. They that hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be filled. "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." *2 Corinthians 5:21*. *W. SITI March 24, 1887, page 186.9*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

We have lately received requests from various quarters for an explanation of *2 Corinthians 3:6-11*. We have had an article on that subject in waiting for some time, and it will soon appear in the SIGNSS. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.1*

All persons having any business with the Kentucky Tract and Missionary Society will please take notice that Sister Alice C. Scott, of Cecillian, Hardin County, Ky., has been appointed State Secretary, since Brother Harry Rupert resigned. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.2*

People who expect to have their communications attended to, should sign their full name and address. Even though the communication is only a question that does not require a personal answer, but may be answered through the paper, we must know who sends the question before we answer it. Anonymous letters and questions always go direct to the waste basket. No one should ever write anything to which he is ashamed or afraid to sign his name. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.3*

Says the *Golden Gate* of March 12: "That powerful bands of spirits, embracing the wisest and best of the children of men of all past ages, are now organizing for the spiritual unfoldment of humanity, is the uniform testimony of all our mediums." This is in direct fulfillment of the prophecy: "Voe to the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea! for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time." *Revelation 12:12*. *SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.4*

On the 17th of February, Rev. J. H. Pettengell died, in New Haven, Conn., aged seventy-two. Professor Pettengell was quite widely known as a vigorous writer in behalf of the doctrine of conditional immortality, or eternal life only through Christ. Many extracts from his pen have appeared in the SIGNS, of which he was a constant reader. He retained his connection with the Congregationalist Church until his death, although his pronounced views in regard to conditional immortality, shut him out, years ago, from any pulpit of that denomination.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.5*

Mrs. Bateham, superintendent of the "Sabbath Observance Department" of the National W. C. T. U., has issued a circular to Christian ministers, begging them to preach a sermon on Sabbath observance, "on the first Sabbath of April next." We have no doubt but this request will be quite largely complied with; we hope it will. For the benefit of those who may be in doubt, we will here state that "the first Sabbath in April" falls this year on the second day of the month. Remember the time appointed for the preaching of the sermon-Sabbath, April 2, 1887.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.6*

Speaking of the probable union of the National W. C. T. U. and the Knights of Labor, Joseph Cook said: "Powderly is a Catholic, Miss Willard a Methodist; if they can join hands, they may, as she says, 'lift civilization to a table-land across which Christ may walk.'" It is strange how Christ is ignored by so many who profess to revere his name and who desire the advancement of his cause. How ignored? Just in this way: They have the idea of a temporal kingdom of Christ, and they think that upon them devolves the work of bringing the world to such a state of godliness that Christ will come and take possession. This is National Reform doctrine pure and simple, and it is just what is implied in the above-quoted remark. And so the work of Christ by his Spirit, the only means by which people can be made better, is ignored by those who blindly think that they are honoring him. Why will professed Christian workers imagine that they can do what the Spirit of the Lord cannot, namely, make all people Christians? While they are thus employing impotent human agencies, the world is steadily going to destruction.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.7*

At the request of the California Conference Committee, we publish the following sections from the State constitution, which they would like to have well considered by the churches within the Conference, and by those desiring to labor in any part of it:-*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.8*

"When any church, or scattered brethren, wish ministerial labor in their vicinity, they all should be made to the Executive Committee."*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.9*

"Those who may feel it their duty to exercise their gifts as preachers or colporteurs, shall lay their exercises of mind before the Conference Committee, and the committee may license them if they consider them qualified."*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.10*

"The Seventh Day Is the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

In answer to the question, "Should the Sabbath be kept absolutely holy?" the editor of the *Christian Standard* (March 12, 1887) says:-*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.11*

"The first day of the week, which is called the Lord's day, is not the Sabbath. The Sabbath is the seventh day, or Saturday. This day, as is well known, is observed by the Jews, under the teaching of the law of Moses. They do not, and never did, keep it absolutely holy. The first day of the week is made a day of rest for man and beast by the law of the land.... While the first day of the week is not hedged about with the restrictions that pertained to the Sabbath of the law, it is meant that it be especially devoted to religious services-and not to business or pleasure."*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.12*

Truly, "their rock is not as our rock." The Lord says, "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy;" but the *Standard* says that the Sabbath-day is not to be remembered at all, but that another day, which is not the Sabbath, is to be kept in its place. Let all who read this remember the following truths, which are admitted by this champion of the first-day observance:-*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.13*

1. Saturday is the seventh day.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.14*
2. The seventh day is the Sabbath.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.15*
3. The first day of the week is not the Sabbath.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.16*
4. The observance of the seventh-day Sabbath is enjoined by the law of God.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.17*
5. The observance of the first day, which is not the Sabbath, is enjoined by the law of the land.*SITI March 24,*

There is the whole case in a nut-shell. Reader, can you have any doubt as to your duty?*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.19*

"Training Up Criminals" The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

The trial of a young man in San Francisco, for the murder of a girl, has just been completed. The fact that the murder was committed being well known, there was no attempt to conceal it, and the usual defense, insanity, was resorted to. In proof of his insanity his mother testified that from the time the defendant was a baby he had "spells." "When two or three years of age he would lie down on his back on the floor or on the sidewalk and, without any provocation whatever, would kick, and scream, and cry. He could not be quieted; candy would have no effect on him. As he grew older, these spells would increase." It was also in evidence that on his way home from school one day, he threw a stone, without any provocation, and broke a window.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.20*

Very natural that these spells should increase. But if, in the place of candy, some of Solomon's remedy had been judiciously and vigorously administered, there is no doubt that it would have been effectual in stopping that incipient insanity. We have seen scores of children who were subject to just such "spells." And too often their mothers were training them in it, and preparing the way for their future career as criminals. Everybody is born with greater or less inclination to evil; it is the duty of the parent to counteract this tendency, and by insisting on prompt obedience, to lay the foundation for a law-abiding citizen. But what hope is there for the future, when natural depravity is fostered by parents, and when the very fact that a person is depraved enough to commit a barbarous act is considered evidence that he should not be punished?*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.21*

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, Without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce." *2 Timothy 3:1-3.SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.22*

"Beginning of the Day" The Signs of the Times, 13, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

"Not being clear upon the division of time, I appeal to you for help. It seems to me from some scriptures that the day should begin in the morning. It seems to be more consistent in beginning the day in the morning at the creation. At the resurrection of Christ it says, "As it began to *dawn* toward the first day of the week," etc. And again it speaks of darkness lasting from the sixth to the ninth hour. Now if the day began in the evening it would be dark all the time, and then it would make the crucifixion of Christ in the night. Please answer through the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. C. H. E."*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.23*

If our correspondent will read carefully the first chapter of Genesis he will see that it would not be consistent to begin the day in the morning. Time as distinguished from eternity, is reckoned from the first act of creation. The second verse of the Bible tells us that darkness was upon the face of the deep, that is, upon the chaotic mass which had been spoken into existence. The next act of creation is recorded in the third verse: "And God said, Let there be light; and there was light." This constituted the first day's work. The evening, the darkness, and the morning, the light, were the first day. Here it is seen that in the first day the dark preceded the light part, and consequently the same order must necessarily follow in all succeeding days. The record of creation is alone sufficient to show that the day begins with the evening. Where our correspondent falls into difficulty is in forgetting that while each day is twenty-four hours long, and is composed of a period of darkness and a period of light, the dark part of the day is called night, and the light part is also called day; so we use the word "day" in two senses: (1) as applying to the whole period of twenty-four hours, and (2) as applying to the part of the day when the sun shines.*SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.24*

The Hebrews always began their day at the going down of the sun, but they had a separate reckoning for the hours of the night and for those of the day. The night was divided into four watches of about three hours each; the day was divided into twelve hours. To be sure, at some seasons of the year, there are less than twelve hours of daylight, and at other seasons more, but throughout the year there is an average of just twelve hours of darkness and twelve hours of light in each day. Therefore they reckoned the period of daylight uniformly from six o'clock. Then the first hour of the day would be seven o'clock, the third hour nine o'clock, the sixth hour twelve, the ninth hour three o'clock, and the twelfth hour six o'clock. So at the crucifixion of Christ darkness was from noon until three o'clock. This mode of reckoning is everywhere used in the Bible and yet it is well understood that the day properly began at evening, as we read in *Leviticus 23:32*, "From even unto

even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath." *SITI March 24, 1887, page 192.25*

March 31, 1887

“Fearing the Lord and Serving Idols” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

A reader of the SIGNS asks an answer to the following questions:-*SITI March 31, 1887, page 198.1*

“If a person hears ‘present truth,’ and, feeling anxious about it, goes to the Lord for guidance, and receives the answer in a dream that he is to keep both days [*i.e.* Sabbath and Sunday], is it sure to be from God?*SITI March 31, 1887, page 198.2*

“Would it be keeping the commandments of God to keep both days?”*SITI March 31, 1887, page 198.3*

To both the above questions we can say emphatically, No. For what reason? This:-*SITI March 31, 1887, page 198.4*

1. The Lord has plainly declared that “the seventh day is the Sabbath.” That is his “holy day.” Six days of the week he has given to man in which to work, but the seventh day he demands shall be devoted to his service. Now when the Lord has declared one thing in his word, he will not reveal something directly contrary by means of a dream. But if it be urged that if the answer by dream is that both days shall be kept, *that* is not in opposition to the word of God, we answer,*SITI March 31, 1887, page 198.5*

2. To do what God has not required, is to do directly contrary to his word. The truth of this will appear when we consider that in his word God has required everything that is right, everything that is duty. There is not a thing which man ought to do, that is not commanded in the Bible. Then if a person does something which the Bible does not require, he evidently must be doing something that is not right, or that is wrong. We repeat: if the Bible requires *everything* that is right, there can be nothing right which is not required in the Bible; but everything that is not right is wrong; therefore everything that is not required in the Bible is wrong.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 198.6*

The same truth may be stated thus: The fact that a certain thing is required as a duty, shows that something entirely different, and opposed, is not a duty. If God is so careful lest we should do wrong, that he tells us just what he wants us to do, it is evident that if there is something that he does not tell us to do, it is because he does not want us to do it; and to do what the Lord does not want us to do, is just as surely a sin as it is to fail to do what he wants us to do. The man to whom the Lord should sternly ask, “Who hath required this at your hand?” would be as much at a loss for an answer as the one to whom he should say, “Why hast thou not done this?”*SITI March 31, 1887, page 198.7*

Now just as surely as the Lord does require the observance of the seventh day of the week, he does *not* require the observance of the first day of the week. The commandment says, “Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work.” While it is doubtless true that this is not an imperative order that every man must work during the whole of the six days, it is a permission to work on any part or the whole of the six days. The six days are given to man; they are termed “the six working days” (*Ezekiel 46:1*), in distinction from the Sabbath, which is a rest day. God has laid no more claim to Sunday than he has to Monday or Wednesday; and to do service which the Lord has not commanded, is to follow the commandments of men, “which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; and not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh.” *Colossians 2:23*.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 198.8*

More than this, the Sabbath is the great sign of which we are to indicate our allegiance to the true God. Sunday, “the wild solar holiday of all pagan times,” has been adopted by the Roman Catholic Church as the badge of its power, and as the sign by which men may indicate their allegiance to the Papacy. As a Catholic writer says, in keeping Sunday Protestants do homage, in spite of themselves, to the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore if a man observes both Sabbath and Sunday, he thereby professes allegiance both to God and to the Pope. But Christ says, “No man can serve two masters.” God requires undivided service. Such worship as was rendered by the Assyrians who were placed in Samaria, is not acceptable to God. They “feared the Lord and served their graven images.” Such ones need an Elijah to say to them as he did to the Jews who were running after Baal, the sun-god: “If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him.”*1 Kings 18:21*.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 198.9*

A few words about going to the Lord for “guidance” in regard to the commandments. We cannot regard it as anything else than an insult to the Lord. When God has plainly revealed his will, it is certainly, to speak plainly, impudent to turn right around and ask him if he means what he says, and if he will not make an exception in the case of the petitioner. Balaam tried that once. The Lord told him not to do a certain thing; but Balaam went to the Lord again and again until at last he actually received permission to go. The end, however, to which

Balaam came should serve as a warning to others who feel inclined to ask the Lord to give up his way for theirs. When God has spoken, let man hold his peace. W.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 198.10*

“Creation and Redemption” The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

The following extract represents a view of these great events which is exceedingly common:-*SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.1*

“The work of creation cost but a word. ‘He spake and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast.’ The work of redemption cost infinitely more than creation. It cost the *death of Christ*. As the work of redemption is grander than that of creation, so the *Lord’s day*, which commemorates its completion, is higher, *hollier, grander* than the Jewish Sabbath, that commemorates the completion of the creation.”*SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.2*

We never read such a statement without a feeling of sadness at the thought that it represents the limited ideas of the work of God, which are entertained by the great majority of people. Such statements do not indicate that the ones making them have exalted ideas of the work of redemption, but that their ideas of the work of creation are extremely narrow.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.3*

It is the height of presumption for anybody to compare creation and redemption; for both are infinite, and far beyond human comprehension. Suppose you take a person who is unacquainted with geography, and place him in an elevated position on the Isthmus of Panama, where he can view at the same time the two oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific. Now ask him which is the larger; if he expresses an opinion, it will be only a conjecture based on no foundation whatever; for he cannot see any difference. His eye can take in just as much of one as of the other, and for aught that his observation teaches to the contrary, they both stretch away into infinite space.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.4*

Stand at the base of two mountains, whose peaks towering up into the sky, are lost in the clouds. Now tell, if you can, which is the higher. You say that you cannot, because you cannot see to the top of either one; and even if you could, your eye could not measure the difference between them, if there should be any. So it is with creation and redemption. Both works are the product of infinite power combined with infinite love, and could have been accomplished by nothing less. But if nothing but infinite power and infinite love could create or redeem the world, certainly nothing less than infinite wisdom can comprehend either one, must less grasp both in one thought, so as to compare them. “Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.” *Hebrews 11:3*. Does that text say that we understand creation? Not at all; it says that we understand that the worlds were formed out of nothing, by the word of God. How do we understand this? Through faith; we know it simply because we believe the word of God, which declares it.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.5*

“By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth,” “for he spake, and it was; he commanded, and it stood fast.” *Psalms 33:6, 9*. Here we have the statement of the fact which we understand only by faith. God spoke, and the worlds came into existence. How easily it was done! says one. Easily done? Yes, easily done by infinite power; but who can conceive of power that could by a word cause that to exist, which previously had no existence? Because God so easily accomplished the work of creation, are we therefore to esteem it a light thing? Far from it. Says the psalmist: “Let all the earth fear the Lord; let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him.” Why? “For he spake, and it was; he commanded and it stood fast.” The power of God as manifested in creation is a most stupendous thing, calling for wonder and awe.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.6*

Let the one who thinks that the work of the creation was a comparatively small affair, try to create something. Let him attempt to make a grain of sand. Let him attempt to make something out of nothing. Attempt! How can he attempt? What would be the first step? All the power of all the created intelligence in the universe is not equal to the creation of the smallest atom of matter. All the combined intelligence of men and angels cannot approach to the shadow of an imagination of how such a thing could be done. Yet God did it with a word. Does that statement depreciate the work of creation? Not by any means. It simply shows the inconceivable power of God.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.7*

The Sabbath was given to men in order that he might contemplate the power of God, and so lead to greater reverence for him. But someone may say that it would be monotonous to meditate week after week upon one thing. Not unless the man is in one of the classes mentioned in *Psalms 92:6*. The creation of God, like himself, is infinite; and as men by searching cannot find out God, so as to know the Almighty to perfection (*Job 11:7*); so no man can ever fathom God’s creation. Only when we rightly understand the object of the Sabbath, can we appreciate the psalm for the Sabbath day:-*SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.8*

"It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord, and to sing praises unto thy name, O most High; to show forth thy lovingkindness in the morning, and thy faithfulness every night, upon an instrument of ten strings, and upon the psaltery; upon the harp with a solemn sound. For thou, Lord, hast made me glad through thy work; I will triumph in the works of thy hands. O Lord, how great are thy works! and thy thoughts are very deep. A brutish man knoweth not; neither doth a fool understand this." *Psalm 92:1-6. SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.9*

It would be folly to attempt to convey to anyone, by words, any sense of the work of creation. All that we can do is to tell the reader to meditate upon it. But let no one think that the work of creation was simply a manifestation of power. In the creation, God's love is also manifested. Was it not unselfish love that caused God to create beings in his own image, capable of the highest pleasures, and setting before them an eternity of life, in which their mental and spiritual natures could continually develop, so as to make them capable of still higher enjoyment? Those who fail to see the love of God in creation, should remember that the great work of redemption is only for the purpose of bringing men to the enjoyment of that for which he has created. We are not comparing redemption with creation, for that is impossible; but we are showing that in the creation God manifested love as well as power. But if it is admitted that the love of God combined with his power, in creation, it must be admitted that the creation was the result of infinite love as well as of infinite power; for God, the infinite, must love to an infinite degree. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.10*

The Sabbath, the seventh day, was instituted as a memorial of creation. This is necessarily admitted in the claim that Sunday should be kept instead of Saturday because redemption is greater than creation. Now the man who says that the Sabbath ought no longer to be kept, thereby says that God's power and love should be no longer remembered. And that is equivalent to saying that God himself ought to no longer be remembered! And that is still further equivalent to saying that the work of redemption ought not to be considered; for God is Redeemer as well as Creator. In other words, no one can speak slightly of the Sabbath as the memorial of creation, without disparaging the work of creation; but he who has narrow views of the love and power of God in creation, necessarily has narrow views of God himself; and he who has narrow views of God, cannot place a high estimate upon the work of redemption. And now we can better understand these words: "Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctifieth them." *Ezekiel 20:12. SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.11*

Of the greatness of redemption it is not necessary to speak here particularly. They who affect to compare creation and redemption, profess to adore the infinite love and power manifested in the gospel; although, as we have shown, they can have exalted ideas of this only in proportion as they entertain exalted views of God's love and power in creation. Enough to say that the redemption of man is accomplished at an infinite cost. Says Paul: "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the *unsearchable riches of Christ*." *Ephesians 3:8*. And Peter says that even the angels desire (but in vain) to comprehend the love of God as manifest in the gospel. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.12*

Should not so great a work as this be commemorated? Should not men leave something to keep the great work of redemption in mind? Most assuredly, but not at the expense of the memorial of creation. The idea that men cannot show their appreciation of the plan of salvation without despising the work of God in the creation, is as monstrous as the idea that is sometimes advanced, that men cannot worship Christ without turning away from their allegiance to God! On this matter of recognizing the work of redemption, by some act, we have the following points to offer: - *SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.13*

1. The work of redemption, instead of having been completed at the resurrection, is not yet completed. Redemption is complete only when all the effects of the curse have been obliterated. When redemption is completed, there will be no further work to be done for man. That is the crowning act in the great plan of salvation. Christ is made unto us, "wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." Redemption is the last of all. It includes not only salvation from sin, but from death and the possibility of it. It includes also the renovation of the earth. Read a few texts: - *SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.14*

Ephesians 1:13, 14: "In whom [*i.e.*, in Christ] ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." Here we see that the Spirit is given to those who believe, not because they are redeemed, but only as a pledge of their future redemption. Now read a still more direct statement concerning those who have this witnessing Spirit. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.15*

Romans 8:22, 23: "For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body*." What this redemption of the body is, Paul shows in *Philippians 3:20, 21*: - *SITI March 31, 1887, page 199.16*

"For our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall

change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." *SITI March 31, 1887, page 200.1*

Then it is utterly impossible to commemorate completed redemption, because we are yet waiting for redemption. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 200.2*

2. The work of redemption must be kept in mind, but by the appropriate ceremonies. There is not an intimation in the entire Bible, that God would have us keep Sunday or any other day in commemoration of the work of redemption either partial or complete. When people do what the Bible does not tell them to do, they always make mistakes. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 200.3*

In *Ephesians 1:7* and *Colossians 1:14* we are told that we have redemption through the blood of Christ. But his blood was shed upon Friday; must we therefore conclude that we must keep Friday? By no means. After giving the manner of celebrating the Lord's supper, Paul says: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." *1 Corinthians 11:26*. There is a divinely appointed ordinance by which we can commemorate so much of the work of redemption as has been completed. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 200.4*

But is there nothing as a memorial of the glorious resurrection of Christ? Indeed there is. Says Paul: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." *Romans 6:3, 4. SITI March 31, 1887, page 200.5*

In baptism we have a memorial both of the death and the resurrection of Christ. "Oh, but," says one, "that is only a single act; we want a constantly recurring memorial of the resurrection." We submit that the Lord knows what we want, far better than we do; but it is a mistake to say that the remembrance of the resurrection lies only at the beginning of the Christian life. Read again: "That like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk [every day] in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also [all our lives] in the likeness of his resurrection." So the whole Christian life, if it is indeed a Christian life, is a constant likeness of the resurrection of Christ. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 200.6*

We have only touched upon this great theme, but we have indicated the proper lines for thought upon it. We find that we do not have to belittle one part of God's work, in order to greatly appreciate another part. On the contrary, we cannot properly appreciate one part of his work without exalting every other part, for all are related. Both creation and redemption are to be ever kept in mind. By the Lord's Supper we show the Lord's death till he come, to redeem us; and then we will "sing the song of Moses the servant of God [*Exodus 15:1-19*], and the song of the Lamb." (*Revelation 15:2, 3*)-celebrating redemption completed. And then will creation itself be commemorated as it should be, for then will men properly appreciate the love and power of God; therefore "it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." *Isaiah 66:23. W. SITI March 31, 1887, page 200.7*

"The Lord's Prayer. Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread" The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

"GIVE US THIS DAY OUR DAILY BREAD"

Nothing less than divine wisdom could have framed this petition, so simple and so reasonable is it. Human greed would ask for enough to-day to supply all possible wants for the future; but if that were granted, the person could use no more of it to-day than he would use if he had only enough for to-day's needs. Not only so, but human greed would overreach itself. Thus, if the man should to-day receive enough for all time, he would have no occasion to ask for anything to-morrow. He would trust in his possession instead of God, and would soon forget God. Thus cutting himself off from the only power that can bestow and preserve, he would soon lose what he has, and then have nothing either for to-day or to-morrow. Riches make to themselves wings and fly away. But the man who every day asks for provision sufficient for that day, with the assurance that he will receive it, is far better off. He has enough for to-day, and that is all he could use anyway. And then he does not wear himself out in the vain effort to take care of property that he has stored up for the future. His future supply is in the hands of God, who thus becomes his banker. Surely the man who has all he needs, just when he needs it, while someone else takes care of that which he does not actually need, is far better off than the man who has only what he needs to-day, but who is burdened with the care of a lot of stuff that he may never need. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 203.1*

This petition teaches contentment. The conclusions in the preceding paragraph are in harmony with the teaching of the apostle Paul. Said he: "But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing

into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." *1 Timothy 6:6-10. SITI March 31, 1887, page 203.2*

Here the apostle brings out an additional danger from not trusting God for our daily bread. It is that the man having more than he needs for to-day, is tempted to use more than he needs. Thus his thoughts become centered entirely on self and the gratification of his own desires and lusts, which increase and multiply with the gratification, until he is finally drowned in perdition. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 203.3*

The apostle continues: "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy." This is in harmony with the petition which the Lord has taught us. We are not taught that to have riches is sin, for the Lord gives some men power to get wealth, but that the sin comes in setting one's heart upon them. The possession of riches is a great danger for Christ says: "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" This is because it is next to impossible for one who has riches to keep from setting his heart upon them, and so neglecting to trust in the living God, and forgetting that it is God who gives us all things richly to enjoy. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 203.4*

This is taught by the parable in *Luke 12:15-21*. "The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully." Here we see that it was not the man's superior skill that brought him his wealth, but the providence of God in giving "rain and fruitful seasons." And the man thought: "What shall I do, because I have no room where to bestow my fruits? And he said, 'This will I do. I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my fruits, and my goods, and I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years, take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry.'" If he had listened to the Lord, he might have known what to do with his goods. Says the inspired word: "Charge them that are rich.... that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." *1 Timothy 6:17-19*. Instead of this, the man trusted in his riches, and had nothing. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 203.5*

"But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" Why is the man called a fool? Because the fool, according to the Bible, is one who says in his heart, "There is no God." This man acted as though there were no God, because he assumed that he must take care of himself, and left God out of the account altogether. He may have been a professor of religion, but he was practically an atheist. There are thousands of such men in the world to-day. But no matter how much they exalt themselves (for the man who by his actions assumes that his prosperity depends upon himself alone, virtually puts himself in the place of God), they will in the end be put in fear, and be made to know that they are but men. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 203.6*

"So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God." We have already read from Paul the injunction to rich men to lay up store for themselves "a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life." In the Sermon on the Mount Christ said: "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through nor steal; for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." *Matthew 6:19-21*. Neither of these texts implies that the kingdom of God can be bought with money. But they both teach that no man can reach Heaven unless he has his treasure there. It is not that his wealth buys him a place in the kingdom of God, but that his thoughts are of God and Heaven, and thus he prepares for Heaven. In all his ways he acknowledges God, and thus God directs his paths. *SITI March 31, 1887, page 203.7*

At the present time the principle contained in the petition, "Give us this day our daily bread," needs to be taught; because the tendency of the last days is all against it. We read: "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days." *James 5:1-3*. This does not apply to the millionaires alone, but to all who are heaping treasure. That is, to all who allow their treasures to "heap" up or accumulate. Some time ago we saw a gold piece that was discolored by rust. We asked what caused it, and learned that it had been paid out by a woman who, having a little more money than she needed, had buried the surplus in the ground. She was not a rich woman, but we could not help thinking of the words of James. But the principle of heaping up treasure was there, which showed distrust of God. And what made it worse was that the woman professed to believe in the soon coming of the Lord. Whether we are poor or rich, let us "beware of covetousness; for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth;" and let us not fear to trust the Lord, knowing that if God clothes the grass and the lilies of the field in beauty, and provides for the sustenance of the birds of the air, he will much more care for those whom

he has bought with the blood of his own dear Son. The sacrifice of Christ is the pledge of God's care for us. "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?" *Romans 8:32. W.SITI March 31, 1887, page 206.1*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

The Knights of Labor are beginning to join the clamor for enforced Sunday observance. At the meeting which they recently held in Chicago, to consider this matter, "Mr. McFadden, of District 57, representing 10,000 men, said that his assembly had passed resolutions forbidding any member to buy or sell on Sunday." The Knights will be a valuable. Reinforcement to the "National Reform" cause. We shall now have a chance to see whether the devotion of the National Reformers to anti-secret society principles is strong enough to lead them to refuse to cooperate with the Knights in working for a Sunday law.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 208.1*

We learn that the Massachusetts Legislature has been discussing a local option Sunday Law, the idea being that a uniform law cannot be enforced, and that each town should in this matter legislate for itself. We suggest as a better plan, an individual option law. Let Sunday be kept by each individual who wants to keep it. Then if there is a community where all want to keep Sunday, they will have a Sunday law. But don't compel a few people to keep Sunday, against their conscience, because the majority have not conscience enough in the matter to keep it without making a law to compel themselves to keep it.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 208.2*

Newspapers that deal largely in gossip and sporting news usually make that work when they venture to make a statement on a subject connected with the Bible. The S. F. *Chronicle*, speaking of the liberation of Freeman, the Pocasset child murderer, says: "A head of a family who adopts the Mosaic doctrine that he has the right of life for death over his offspring, is better behind bars." We fully agree, that a man who thinks he has a right to kill his children, is a dangerous man to be at large; but we would like to know the whereabouts and the writings of Moses there is any such doctrine as that a father has the right of life or death over his offspring. People hold the Bible accountable for a good many things that exist only in their own brain.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 208.3*

In answer to the question, "Do we get our immortality through belief in and acceptance of Christ, or is it inherent in the entire race?" The *Christian Union* recently said: "We are not prepared to answer this question dogmatically; neither opinion has some support from Scripture. Belief in what is called a conditional immortality is comparatively modern, we believe, but has certainly grown within the last quarter-century." *SITI March 31, 1887, page 208.4*

The answer (?) is correct with the exception of two points: Inherent immortality finds no support whatever in the Scriptures; and the belief in conditional immortality is by no means modern; it is as old as the knowledge of gospel truth among men, and is taught all through the Bible.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 208.5*

The San Francisco *Evening Bulletin* has an editorial entitled, "The Reign of Peace." The second sentence of which reads thus: "It is now evident that there will be no war in Europe for a least a few months." And then the writer adds: "It will be happy circumstance of the duration of peace can be measured by years." Here is a good text for those who preach a temporal millennium of peace and safety. It is actually certain that, if something unexpected does not happen, there will be no war in Europe for a few months! It is quite probable that there will be no fighting until the weather becomes more favorable for the movement of troops. And this is "the reign of peace."*SITI March 31, 1887, page 208.6*

Religious liberty has had a narrow escape in Texas. A rigid Sunday law bill had passed the Assembly and had been favorably reported upon by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, before those who would be most affected by it-the Sabbath-keepers-were aware that there was any effort on foot to secure a Sunday law. By prompt action the insertion of a section making an exception in favor of observers of the seventh day was secured, and at last reports it was thought that this amendment would be accepted by both Houses. The principal opposition to making this provision for Sabbath-keepers came from a member who is a clergyman. Yet some people will persist in declaring that there is not the slightest possibility of religious persecution in this country.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 208.7*

"The Arbiter of Europe" The Signs of the Times, 13, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

It is stated upon the authority of the *Journal des Debats* that the Prussian minister at the Vatican has suggested that the Pope convene a European Congress to settle the Eastern and Egyptian questions. "This," says the *Catholic Mirror*, "would be 'a consummation devoutly to be wished.'" Certainly all Catholics do

devoutly wish for everything that will in any way intend to the restoration of the temporal power of the Papacy, and a congress of the kind proposed with a long step in that direction.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 208.8*

There is certainly a growing disposition among the great powers of the earth to confer honor upon the Pope; and while there is not the slightest chance that the peace of Europe can be permanently preserved, stranger things have happened than that an effort be made to close forever the temple of Janus by making the Bishop of Rome arbitrer, not only of Europe, but of the world.*SITI March 31, 1887, page 208.9*

It was only a few months ago that "his holiness" was called upon to decide the dispute between Germany and Spain relative to the Caroline Islands, and within a few weeks past he has meddled in German politics to the immense satisfaction not only of Prince Bismarck and Emperor William but of President Grevy as well. In close connection with this comes the proposition of Austria that the "holy father" should act as referee in the Bulgarian difficulty; and now to cap it all comes this proposition from Germany that he shall be acknowledged as the arbiter of Europe. Is not the world about to fall down at the feet of the Papacy and worship "the beast which had the wound by the sword and did live"?*SITI March 31, 1887, page 208.10*

April 7, 1887

"The Day of the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; ... for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." *SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.1*

Language could not be framed so as to express more clearly the fact that the Sabbath of the Lord was permanently fixed upon a definite, specified day. The last charge to be brought against the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is that of indefiniteness. If it is not definite, then language cannot be made to convey ideas. *SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.2*

But among the "inventions" that men have "sought out" is the theory that the commandment does not prescribe the observance of a certain day recurring at regular intervals, but that it enjoins the observance of one-seventh part of our time. The term "sought out" is fitly applied to this invention, for no trace of this theory appears in the commandment. It was brought to light about two hundred years ago as the only alternative of those who wished to persuade themselves and others that they were keeping the commandment, while at the same time they were observing a day of their own choosing. But this is one of the thinnest disguises ever invented. It is a very easy matter to show its absurdity, as we will demonstrate. Notice carefully the following argument: *SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.3*

If God sanctified an indefinite seventh part of time, he must of necessity have left it optional with man to choose which day he would keep; the only thing commanded would be rest; man could suit his own convenience as to time. It would then follow that whatever day man should choose to rest upon, *that* would be the portion of time sanctified; and thus the act of the Creator would be dependent on the fact of the creature. But it is not at all consistent with the dignity of even a human lawgiver to make the meaning of his enactments contingent on the caprice of the people; much less would such a course reflect honor upon the Government of God. *SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.4*

But this is not the worst result that would naturally follow. If an indefinite seventh part of time were sanctified, then not only would it be left to man to choose the day for rest, but each individual would be at liberty to rest upon the day which might please his fancy. One man might take the seventh day, and another might take the fourth, and then, according to this theory, not one-seventh but two-sevenths of the time would be sanctified. Or, to suppose a case which would be very likely to happen if men should actually try to put their theory into practice, every day in the week might be kept by different individuals, and then it would appear that in the beginning God had sanctified or set apart *all* the time! But in that case what would become of the theory that he sanctified only a seventh? We submit to anyone that this is not a forced conclusion; if the conclusion is absurd, it simply proves that the theory in question is absurd. *SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.5*

But before men reach this point in their endeavors to evade the law of God, they usually recover their reasoning faculties to some extent, and say that it is necessary for all men to keep one and the same day. The exigencies of business require it. Then we ask, Who shall appoint the day? What man is there whose judgment all will follow? There is no man or class of men whose authority even a majority of persons will acknowledge, so as to defer to it. In a case that is left open, every man is on an equality with every other. There is positively no way out of this dilemma but to admit what the commandment plainly declares, -that God, in the beginning, decided definitely which day of the week should be observed. So we see that the one-seventh-part-of-time theory is an impossibility when reduced to practice. And even if it were possible for all men to agree upon some day of their own choosing, that day would be *their* Sabbath, and not the Sabbath of the Lord, which the commandment enjoins. *SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.6*

But some will still say, "Granting that a definite day was set apart, how can we tell which one it was?" This must be an easy question to answer, else it were useless to have a definite day appointed. The commandment says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath." Mark, *the* seventh day, not a seventh day. The seventh day of what? Not of the month, for that would not meet the demand for a rest after six days of labor. For the same reason it cannot mean the seventh day of the year. It must mean the seventh day of a period of time of which seven days is the sum. But this is the week; and we therefore are shut up to the conclusion that the commandment enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week. A really candid, thoughtful person could not decide otherwise. *SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.7*

For further proof that the seventh day of the week is meant, read *Luke 23:54-56; 24:1*. The sacred historian after describing the crucifixion and burial of Christ, says: "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on. And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher,

and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment*." Now if we can find what day it was on which they rested, we shall know beyond all doubt which day is "the Sabbath-day according to the commandment." The next verse says: "Now upon the *first day of the week*, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared." To avoid any possibility of cavil, we turn to *Mark 16:1*, and there read that this visit took place "when the Sabbath was past." Luke, then, has given us in consecutive order the record of three days, as follows: Christ was crucified on "the preparation day;" the day following was the Sabbath, upon which the women rested "according to the commandment;" and the next day was the *first day of the week*. This proves unmistakably that the Sabbath of the commandment is the seventh day of the week. W.SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.8

"Questions and Answers" The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

"While conversing recently on the subject of Immortality, this idea was presented to me: If Christ, when crucified, died, body and spirit, the world was without a Saviour for three days, and anyone who died during that period could not be saved. SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.9

"Although the idea presents nothing conclusive to my mind, yet I would like to have your idea of it through the SIGNS. J. H. A." SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.10

It is astonishing to see the ingenuity displayed in inventing objections to the truth. If half as much time as is spent in trying to evade the truth, were spent in studying it, the number of believers would be increased many fold. In the above objection the ingenuity of unbelief is manifested to a marked degree. SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.11

The answer to this cavil is found in *John 3:16*: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." And this: "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." *Romans 5:8*. And this also: "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." *Romans 8:32*, 33. SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.12

The objection which was presented to our correspondent was based upon the impious idea that God is a stern, unrelenting Judge, whose only emotion toward the human race is that of hatred, and that he is prevented from spitefully tearing men in pieces only because of the watchfulness and interference of the Son, who is all love and pity. But God himself is love, and the texts just quoted show that the plan of salvation is from the Father as well as from the Son. Christ died for sinners; but God's love for the world is manifested in giving his only begotten Son to die. We cannot make comparisons, so as to say whether the love of the Father was greater than that of the Son; but we can say this: God is love; he is also infinite; therefore his love is infinite love; consequently his love for the world was infinite love, and the sacrifice which he made for the world, in giving his dear Son to die for them, was an infinite sacrifice. In view of these facts, knowing that the plan of salvation is "the gospel of God" (*Romans 1:1*), it is the height, or rather the depth, of folly, yea, of unreasoning blasphemy, for anyone to intimate that mankind could not be trusted in the hands of the Father alone, during the brief space in which he, together with the Son, was making the sacrifice for their redemption. God the Father is not only our Judge, but he is also our Saviour. See *1 Timothy 2:3*; *Jude 25*. SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.13

One word more: The objector says that if Christ did actually and entirely die, then the world was for three days without a Saviour. We have shown the falsity of that, and now make a simple counter-statement: If Christ did not actually die, then the world has not now, and never had, a Saviour for all the blessings which God has for men, are secured to us only through the death of Christ. *Romans 8:32*; *1 Corinthians 15:16-18*. SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.14

CHRIST SOON TO RETURN

"You would be conferring a great favor on me and many that I know, by explaining how Adventists can believe Christ is soon to return, when none of the signs mentioned in *Matthew 24:29*; *Luke 20:11, 12, 25*, and other passages, have to come to pass. "E. A. G." SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.15

Our questioner makes a very broad assumption. It is possible that he is unaware of the fulfillment of any of the signs referred to, but he is not warranted in saying that they have never come to pass, simply because he has not heard of them. For his benefit, and that of others who are in the same condition, we will briefly note the fulfillment of these signs. This we are always glad to do. *Matthew 24:29* reads thus: SITI April 7, 1887, page

"Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken." *Verse 30* continues: "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." *SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.17*

The "days" referred to in the first part of *verse 29*, and the days of tribulation referred to in *verses 21 and 22*. We do not think it necessary to take space here to prove that "the elect" have never suffered tribulation greater than that suffered by them in the dark ages of Papal persecution. This one period ended with the captivity of the Pope, in A.D. 1798, a few years after the violence of the persecution ceased, and serves as a guide in our search for the signs; for the first of these signs was to take place "immediately after the tribulation of those days," or, as Mark still more definitely records, "in those days, after that tribulation." Concerning the first sign, the darkening of the sun, we need to do more than quote what is said in "Webster's Unabridged Dictionary," in the explanatory and pronouncing vocabulary of noted names of fiction, events, etc.: *-SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.18*

"DARK DAY, THE, May 19, 1780;-so called on account of a remarkable darkness on that day, extending over all New England. In some places persons could not see to read common print in the open air for several hours together. Birds sang their evening song, disappeared, and became silent; fowls went to roost; cattle sought the barn-yard; and candles were lighted in the houses. The obscuration began about ten o'clock in the morning, and continued till the middle of the next night, but with differences of degree and duration in different places. For several days previous the wind had been variable but chiefly from the southwest and the northeast. The true cause of this remarkable phenomenon is now known." *SITI April 7, 1887, page 214.19*

It would not make a particle of difference if the true cause of the phenomenon were known. Its value as a sign consists in the fact that it was just what our Saviour said should take place, and that it occurred in the exact time specified, just before the close of the period of Papal supremacy, and just after the great tribulation. There is one sign fulfilled. *SITI April 7, 1887, page 215.1*

The next sign is the falling of the stars. On this it will be sufficient to quote the following statement by Professor Olmstead, of Yale College: *-SITI April 7, 1887, page 215.2*

"Those who were so fortunate as to witness the exhibition of shooting stars on the morning of Nov. 13, 1833, probably saw the greatest display of celestial fireworks that has ever been since the creation of the world, or at least within the annals covered by the pages of history." *SITI April 7, 1887, page 215.3*

Those who witnessed this remarkable event, say that it was a literal fulfillment of *Revelation 6:13*: "And the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." The stars appeared as if violently hurled in every direction, just as would be the case with unripe fruit, if it were forced from the limbs by a strong wind. And it was not simply a few shooting stars, but the flying meteors could be likened only to flakes of snow in a furious snowstorm. So much for the fulfillment of the second sign. *SITI April 7, 1887, page 215.4*

"And upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity," is the next thing recorded by Luke. He who says that this is not even now fulfilled and fulfilling, must have studiously refrained from reading any of the newspapers. Organized bands of Socialists and Anarchists are not only caused by poverty and oppression, but are themselves, in turn, causes of still greater distress and perplexity. The nations of Europe are spending all their capital and credit in arming themselves against possible attacks from one another, yet, as in the case of Russia, are so fearful of the enemy within their own borders, that they often contemplate even the dreaded war with foreign powers, as a possible means of uniting their subjects, and averting the still more dreaded disruption. These things literally cause men's hearts to fail them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth. *SITI April 7, 1887, page 215.5*

Only one of the signs which are Saviour mentioned yet remains to be fulfilled, and that is the shaking of the powers of the heavens. But this takes place immediately in connection with the coming of the Lord, so that when it is seen, it will be too late to warn people to prepare for the coming of the Lord. The shaking of the powers of the heavens accomplished by the voice of God (*Hebrews 12:26*), when he shall "roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem" (*Joel 3:16*); when the heavens shall depart as a scroll when it is rolled together, and every mountain and island shall be moved out of their places; when "the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man" shall hide themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, and shall say to the mountains and the rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" *Revelation 6:14-17. SITI*

April 7, 1887, page 215.6

Let no one, then, comfort himself with the thought that the Lord's coming is not near, because the powers of the heavens have not been shaken. Rather let him discern the signs of the times, and make haste to be ready to greet our soon-coming Lord with the words, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." *Isaiah 25:9*. W.SITI April 7, 1887, page 215.7

"Union for the Sake of Peace" The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

We are urged to cease our opposition to Sunday, and to the securing of Sunday laws, for the sake of peace. Christ prayed that his disciples might all be one, and so we are admonished that we ought to unite with those Christians who keep Sunday, that the world may have an example of Christian unity. But why should we join with them rather than they with us? Oh, because they are in the majority, and they say that the majority ought to rule. But when it is well known that it is a matter of conscience with the minority, to say that the majority should rule is simply to say that the minority have no business to have a conscience of their own; that they must allow the majority to be conscience for them. We are fond of peace and harmony, but we do not believe in peace and harmony which is gained by compromising truth. Luther was a man who loved peace and deprecated strife; but if he had not loved truth still more, he could not have been the leader in the Reformation. Truth and error must ever be antagonistic, and as long as there is error in the world, there cannot be peace. SITI April 7, 1887, page 216.1

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Chronicle* says: "By and by the criminal lawyer will rank, in the public esteem, about on a par with the criminal." But why say "by and by"? Within a week we have had the spectacle presented to us of a "criminal" lawyer making a pathetic plea for a brutal murderer on the ground that the culprit "could not control his impulses," and was "morally insane." That is to say, he pleaded for acquittal on the ground that the prisoner was a vile reprobate! Can "criminal" practice to send to any Lord depth of infamy? SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.1

We have before us the Year Book of the California Y.M.C.A. In it we find the report of an address delivered at the last day convention, on "how to awaken a greater interest in Bible study among our active members." It was by Rev. W. J. Chichester, who said, among other things: "Don't confine yourself too much to favorite passages. The Old Testament as well as the New is the word of God. All is not equally given by inspiration, but all is worthy of consideration." Perhaps we ought to feel thankful for the reverend gentleman's admission that all of the Bible is "worthy of consideration." SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.2

The *Occident*, of San Francisco, has a notice of the "Address to Thinking People," on the Sunday Law, and finds that the entire argument is fallacious, because a little quotation from the *Christian at Work* was, by a typographical error, redited to Jan. 3, 1885, instead of Jan. 8, 1885. The argument would not be affected in the least if the entire quotation were omitted be officially as it appeared in the *Christian at Work*. It is worthy of note that the only flaw which the *Occident* could find in the entire argument was in the accidental substitution of 3 for 8. SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.3

By the way, now that we have referred to the *Occident*, we wish to say that it is doing some good work in the matter of unfermented wine at communion. Its correspondent, "Rusticus," has thoroughly exploded the idea that there is no such thing as unfermented wine, and that our Saviour used intoxicating wine at the institution of the Lord's Supper. We are glad to see that there is quite a general movement, "among the churches to return to the scriptural method of celebrating this ordinance. SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.4

"Chart of the Week" The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

The "Chart of the Week," which we noticed when we received a specimen section of it some months ago, is now completed, and is ready for those who have long awaited for it. For the benefit of those who may not have read the previous notice, we will say that the chart shows "the unchanged order of the days, and the true position of the Sabbath, as proved by the combined testimony of ancient and modern languages." The names of the week and of each day in the week are given in one hundred and sixty languages and dialects, presenting most overwhelming proof that the division of the week has remained unchanged in all ages and in

all lands. The chart has nine columns. The first gives the language and the extent of territory where it is, or was, "spoken, read, or otherwise used." The second column gives the word for week, in the original characters of the language named in the preceding column, together with the transmitter, showing the pronunciation, and the corresponding English word. The seven remaining columns to the same for each of the days of the week.*SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.5*

The chart is a most interesting object for study, and shows how universal was the knowledge, in ancient times, of the memorial of creation, thus emphasizing Paul's declaration that they who forgot God are without excuse. As a single instance, we note the very ancient Arabic. The name for week signifies "seven;" the first day of the week is "business day;" the fourth day of the week, Wednesday, is "turning day, or mid-week;" the sixth day, Friday, is "Eve Sabbath," while the seventh day is "Chief or Rejoicing day." Many similar instances might be noted. The chart is thus in itself a strong argument for the universality and perpetuity of the seventh-day Sabbath, and should be in the hands of every lover of the Lord's own day.*SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.6*

Rev. W. M. Jones, 56 Mildmay Park, London, N., author of this chart, and he has put upon it untold amount of conscientious, painstaking labor. The section of the chart showing the days of the week and all the European languages (fifty-three in number) was prepared by Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte.*SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.7*

Considering the importance of the chart, and the immense amount of labor devoted to its preparation, we think the price \$.75 for the paper, and \$1.25 when mounted on linen, with roller, is very reasonable. Orders may be sent to the Pacific Press. If the chart is ordered from the author, post-office orders should be made payable at Newington, Green Road, N., London.*SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.8*

"Signs of the Times" The Signs of the Times, 13, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

Though late reports from Europe tell us that peace is assured, at least for a few months, the conviction is irresistible that the condition of affairs there resembles more nearly a smothered volcano than anything else to which it can be compared. It is true that there is now no immediate prospect of war between France and Germany, but the Eastern question remains practically unchanged. There is no sign that Russia has any intention on Constantinople; and the Bulgarian difficulty is no nearer a settlement than it was three months ago.*SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.9*

Weather unfavorable to military operations has temporarily checked Russian aggression; but Russian intrigue and diplomacy are as active as ever; and he who does not recognise the fact the ere long the Turk is to be driven from Europe to "plant his tabernacle between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain" (Jerusalem), is alike deaf to the language of prophecy, and blind to the signs of the times.*SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.10*

But the Eastern question is not the only menace to the peace of Europe; there is not a nation in the Old World, if indeed there be one anywhere, that does not contain within itself elements which imperil its very existence. Within a month three attempts have been made upon the life of the Czar; and there cannot be a doubt that the whole social, religious, and political fabric of the empire is rotten to the core, being completely honeycombed with Nihilism. Though the absolute ruler of millions of people, Alexander III. is a fugitive from the wrath of his own subjects, and dare not enter his own capital, or, as the Nihilists say, "The Czar has been banished to Gatschina, which is now his prison, and a prison so large that he cannot escape."*SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.11*

England, too, is convulsed with internal feuds, and there is every prospect that a new era of dynamite outrages is about to be inaugurated there by Irish agitators, who despair of ever getting justice for their country by parliamentary methods; and who believe that it is only by blowing up public buildings in English cities and making it costly to continue governing Ireland, that their demands will ever be listened to and home rule granted. Should the Coercion Act now before Parliament be passed, we may expect a reign of terror and bloodshed in England unequalled in any country since the French Revolution.*SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.12*

The same spirit of lawlessness and unrest that prevails in Russia and England, characterizes, though possibly in a less degree, the rest of the world. Only a few days since, Mayor Harrison, of Chicago, in declining a re-nomination said that he feared serious trouble in that city within the next two years; and that if he were mayor he should not dare to leave the city more than half a day's journey. And Chicago is not in very much worse case than the rest of our great cities. Altogether the outlook is far from reassuring, and instead of the much-talked-of temporal millennium being about to be ushered in, the earth is filled with violence, and in many quarters we see "men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things that are coming on the earth."*SITI April 7, 1887, page 224.13*

April 14, 1887

"The Unpardonable Sin" The Signs of the Times, 13, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

"Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." *Matthew 12:31, 32.**SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.1*

Probably no other text in the Bible has been the subject of more speculation, or has been more misunderstood, than this one. Many honest, conscientious people have gone well-nigh into despair over the thought that they were guilty of the sin here mentioned, and that simply because they had received erroneous ideas as to what that sin is. Although there is so much misunderstanding in regard to it, we think that an understanding of it may be gained quite readily by a consideration of the connection and of parallel texts. Every word which our Saviour uttered was timely, and applied to the circumstances then present; it is this feature which makes them practical in all ages. Therefore if we would get a full understanding of any of his words, we must consider the occasion which called them out.*SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.2*

If we notice the context, we shall find that the words which we have quoted were called out by the position which the Pharisees took concerning a notable miracle which Jesus had performed. He had healed a demoniac who was both blind and dumb, so that the man was not only in his right mind, but "both spake and saw." The people were amazed, but the Pharisees contemptuously and blasphemously said: "This fellow does not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils." *Matthew 12:24.* Instead of glorifying God, by whose Spirit this wonderful thing was done, they accused Christ of having a devil, by whose aid he performed miracles.*SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.3*

That this accusation constituted, in that instance, the unpardonable sin, is evident from the parallel text in Mark. This evangelist gives our Saviour's words concerning the unpardonable nature of the sin against the Holy Spirit, and adds, "Because they said, He hath an unclean spirit." *Mark 3:30.* Thus we find, without any further investigation, that this sin consists in attributing the work of the Holy Spirit to the devil.*SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.4*

But it is not by words alone that men may commit this, any more than any other sin. Paul speaks of some who "profess that they know God; but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate." *Titus 1:16.* A reprobate is one who is rejected, who has sinned beyond recovery; one who has rejected the Spirit of God by sinning until he is so corrupt that there is no good thing in him for the Spirit to work upon. This is indicated in the preceding verse, which says of those who are "unto every good work reprobate," that "even their mind and conscience is defiled." So Paul writes to Timothy concerning men in the last days, who are "men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith." *2 Timothy 3:8.**SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.5*

This was the condition of the antediluvian world. The record says: "And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." *Genesis 6:3, 5.* There was a time when the antediluvians were not wholly bad; there was some trace of the law in their hearts (*Romans 2:15*), and therefore there was something in them upon which the Spirit could work to convince them of sin; for the Spirit's sword is the word of God, and it can produce an impression upon men only when they possess some knowledge of truth and right. But the antediluvians resisted the strivings of the Spirit. The tendency of sin is to multiply itself and to choke out any sense of good; and so by repeated stiflings of every good impulse, those people become so corrupt that they had not a single good thought. They were cumberers of the ground; there was no possibility of their reformation, and so they were cut off.*SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.6*

In every case where the judgments of God have been brought upon people, it was because there was no possibility of their reformation; they had, in short, committed the unpardonable sin. This was the case with the antediluvians, the Sodomites, the wicked inhabitants of Canaan (see *Genesis 15:16*), who were destroyed to make room for the Israelites, and finally with many of the people of Israel. Says the sacred historian:-*SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.7*

"Moreover all the chief of the priests, and the people, transgressed very much after all the abominations of the heathen; and polluted the house of the Lord which he had hallowed in Jerusalem. And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, rising up betimes, and sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling place; but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and

misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till *there was no remedy*." 2 Chronicles 36:14-16. *SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.8*

"There was no remedy;" that is, their sin was unpardonable. Now since God's object in giving men this existence is solely that they may prepare for a better, and an eternal existence, it follows that when they utterly refuse to accept of God's plan for them, and devote themselves wholly to evil, there is no use to continue their existence longer. They are of no use to themselves or to anybody else. Like trees that bear only thorns instead of fruit, they are cut off as cumberers of the ground. Their continued existence would be only detrimental to the soil which might be yielding something useful. Here then is another way in which men may commit the unpardonable sin. *SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.9*

Still another way is brought to view by Paul to the Hebrews. This pertains especially to those who have once made a profession. Says the apostle:-*SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.10*

"For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." *Hebrews 6:4-6. SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.11*

We have not space to enter into details, and to specify just how men crucify Christ afresh; but it is sufficient to know that the unpardonable sin is here brought to view, for it is a sin which cannot be repented of. We say "*the unpardonable sin*," for we understand that there is but one such although there may be many different ways of committing it. John says: "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and God shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death; I do not say that he shall pray for it." *1 John 5:16*. All sin, if not repented of, brings death; but there is one sin which cannot be repented of, and therefore there is no necessity to pray about it as about other sins. *SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.12*

Now we may understand what the apostle means when he says to the Hebrews that it is impossible if certain ones fall away, to renew them unto repentance. What does he mean by, "If they fall away"? Does he mean that if a Christian shall fall into sin he cannot be forgiven? No; for the verse just quoted from John teaches us that if a brother sins a sin not unto death we must pray for him. *1 John 2:1, 2; Galatians 6:1; Revelation 2:5*, and scores of other texts show that men are not necessarily beyond hope, even though they be overtaken in faults after they have accepted Christ and have been pardoned. We must understand, then, that the "falling away" here brought to view means not simply the commission of a wrong act, or even a backslidden state, but a turning away from the gospel of Christ, a rejection of Christ. Since the name of Christ is the only one under Heaven whereby men may be saved, it follows that if a man deliberately rejects that there is no hope for him. It was this fact which led Paul to use such vehement language in his epistle to the Galatians. See *Galatians 1:8, 9*. Any man who should preach a gospel which led the hearers to trust in something else besides Christ, would be deliberately leading them to eternal ruin, and so would be worthy of a curse. There is but one way of salvation; if a man deliberately rejects that, he cannot by any possibility be saved. W. *SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.13*

(Concluded next week.)

"The Old Is Better" The Signs of the Times, 13, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

1. "Please explain how you harmonize the 14th verse of Revelation 22, and the comments upon it, found in SIGNS, March 24, p. 186, with the same verse as given in the New Version, which reads, 'Blessed are they that wash their robes,' etc." *SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.14*

There are some things that we don't try to harmonize; we try to follow the simple truth, and if anything differs from it, that is not a matter that troubles us. In this case we accept the reading of the Authorized Version as preferable to that of the New, and let the matter rest there. *SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.15*

It may seem strange, however, that the two versions, each the work of men skilled in the languages, should have such widely different renderings of the same text. A little explanation will make the matter clear. The Greek of the text as rendered in the Authorized Version is, *poiountes tas entolas autou*. As given in the Revised Version it is, *plouutes, tas stolas auton*. It will be seen that the difference in the words is very slight, so that a copyist might easily make the substitution of one for the other. If the reader has ever seen *fac similes* of some of the ancient manuscripts, he will the more readily understand how such a change might have taken place. As the result, some of the ancient manuscripts have it one way, and some another. The similar expression in *Revelation 7:14* may have been in the mind of the ancient copyist, thus causing him

unconsciously and mechanically to make the substitution. Griesbach regards the reading followed by the New Version as "not to be despised," but worthy of further examination, "though inferior to the received text." *SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.16*

But while following the Authorized Version, we do not find, in this instance, the slightest lack of harmony between the two renderings. It is a fact that only those who keep the commandments of God, will be permitted to partake of the tree of life. *Matthew 7:21; 19:17*, and may other texts, settle this matter positively. It is also true that none will be saved, except those who wash their robes of character in the blood of the Lamb; for "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (*1 John 1:7*); and Christ "was manifested to take away our sin." Now (1) no one can keep the commandments without the help of Christ, whose blood cleanses from sin; and (2) no one can stand, having his robes white, without being a doer of the commandments; for it is sin that defiles, and if one should break the commandments his robes would not be white. Thus they who have kept the commandments of God, and they whose robes are made white, are the same. A blessing pronounced upon those who have kept the commandments of God, is at the same time a blessing pronounced upon those who have washed their robes white. So there is harmony in the two renderings, after all. *SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.17*

2. "Also please state whether the New Version is correct in giving the word 'probation' where the Old Version has 'experience,' in *Romans 5:4*." *SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.18*

We think it is not, for the following reasons: The Greek word signifies both a test, a trial, and also that which results from such a test. Therefore "experience" is an allowable rendering. Now to render it "experience," as in the Authorized Version, makes good sense, for it comports with the facts in the case: patient endurance of tribulation does work out rich experience. But "patience" indicates that the individual is undergoing a testing, a probation and therefore it does not seem consistent to say that this tribulation and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts." *SITI April 14, 1887, page 230.19*

The revisers have given us a good commentary, but they seem often to have been more intent on getting something new than on retaining the simplicity and directness of the sacred text. W. *SITI April 14, 1887, page 231.1*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

A large attendance is expected at the meetings to be held in Oakland, April 22-27. This will be a very important meeting, the most important, in some respects, of any annual meeting that has been held here, and we hope that those who come will come with the determination of staying to the close. The church in Oakland extends a hearty invitation to the friends of the cause in the State, to be present. *SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.1*

Bishop Warren of the M. E. church says that many preachers are so gentle of the feelings of sinners, especially if the sinners are rich, that they preach the gospel something after this style: "Brethren, you must repent, as it were; and be converted, in a measure; or you will be damned, to some extent." It is too true that modern preachers very seldom repeat Christ's unequivocal and emphatic statements, that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." *SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.2*

The reports from the prohibition amendment contest in Michigan are very conflicting. Some say that the amendment is carried, and others that it has been defeated by a majority of 1,500 to 4,000. We understand that Kentucky distillers sent many thousands of dollars into Michigan before the election; and if the fraudulent votes which this money created as counted out, there is little doubt but that the amendment will stand by a handsome majority. If prohibition is a failure, it is passing strange that whisky men should spend so much money in trying to defeat it. *SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.3*

By a private letter from Elder E. E. Marvin, of Tennessee, we learn that the effort to secure the passage of a bill granting humanity from the penalties of the Sunday law, to those who conscientiously observe the seventh day of the week, resulted in failure. We are very sorry to be obliged to chronicle this fact. We had strong hope that Tennessee would follow the example of Arkansas, and put a stop to persecution for conscience' sake. Next week we shall give our readers some of the arguments which were used to defeat the bill; they did not come in time for publication this week. *SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.4*

We have received several hypothetical questions in regard to certain acts performed on the Sabbath, the questioners desiring us to state positively whether or not such acts would be a violation of the Sabbath. We cannot answer them. When anyone wants to know the principles which the Bible lays down to govern our

actions, we will give a Bible answer, so far as our knowledge extends; but we have not enough conscience to supply ourselves and other people too. The Lord gives plain commandments and designs that every person shall be conscience for himself. The only safe rule that we can give is this: If you are in doubt about the correctness of any act, abstain from it.*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.5*

Someone asks us to tell him which is the longest verse in the Bible. We don't know. More than that, we haven't any special curiosity in the matter. There are some lottery schemes gotten up in different parts of the country, usually connected with some so called literary journal whose proprietors offer prizes to the ones who will send correct answers to certain simple questions concerning the Bible. Thus they make a pretense of stimulating Bible investigation. We suspect that our questioner has got hold of one of their offers. We would therefore say here (1) that all such schemes are unmitigated swindles, and (2) that hunting for the longest or the shortest verse in the Bible is not studying the Bible at all. It is no more profitable than it would be to hunt for the largest or the smallest Bible in the world. The way to study the Bible is to *study* it, and any part of it, even the shortest verse, will be found to contain abundant matter for *thought*, without which there can be no study.*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.6*

The following utterance is ascribed to Prince Bismarck:-*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.7*

"I regard peace with the Pope as important as peace with any other foreign power. How long this peace may last-if, indeed, peace is attained with the Roman Church-none can foresee. For its continuance I assume no responsibility."*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.8*

In commenting upon this statement, the *Christian Standard* lays bare the real state of affairs as follows:-*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.9*

"He 'assumes no responsibility,' and would find any pretext to break the unpleasant alliance, and again banish the hated Orders and Jesuitical Seminaries, at any time when he saw it was safe to do it. Nor does Leo like the Protestant Bismarck with unfeigned love, but simply has an ax to grind-and it is the blood-rusted ax which has always found service in hewing down every plant of liberty it could get a stroke at. There is no good faith on either side of this compact, but only an interested conspiracy against human rights."*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.10*

We learn from an Eastern paper that "Michigan has a law which provides that no sign, picture, painting, or other representation of murder, assassination, stabbing, fighting, or any personal violence, or of the commission of any crime, shall be posted, under penalty of fine or imprisonment." If California had a similar law the occupation of a considerable number of sensational artists and bill-posters would be gone; and theaters would have to resort to some other means of corrupting the morals of the young and inexperienced, than with their demoralizing pictures and worse plays. The advertising of legitimate business is all right, but when theaters, houses of ill repute and saloons flaunt in the faces of the public pictures which can but bring a blush to the cheek of modesty, public policy demands that their greed be restrained by law.*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.11*

"Spiritualism a Delusion" The Signs of the Times, 13, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

The Bible plainly teaches the existence of good and bad angels, and that they have a great deal of influence upon our lives; so much so, indeed, that if we are not ministered unto in spiritual things by good angels, we are by evil ones. Of the good angels we read: "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" (*Hebrews 1:14*) while the fallen angels are, we are told, "the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." *Revelation 16:14.**SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.12*

This last scripture we understand refers to the delusion of Spiritualism, which to-day numbers its votaries by millions both in this country and in Europe. Kings and queens have become its devotees, and multitudes are everywhere being led captive by Satan at his will. And why? Simply because the professed church of Christ, both Protestant and Catholic, is almost a unit in teaching those twin errors, the immortality of the soul and the conscious state of the dead. Faith in these errors makes it well nigh impossible for people even now to resist the delusions of Spiritualism, and the time will come when Satan works "with all power, and signs, and lying wonders," that all who are not rooted and grounded on Bible truth will be swept into the whirlpool of this monster delusion.*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.13*

When good angels have appeared to men and have communicated with them as spiritual beings, they have declared themselves to be angels: Said the angel that appeared to Zacharias, "I am Gabriel that stand in the presence of God," but when the spirits of devils come they come professing to be the spirits of the dead. And

it is to this fact that the prophet alludes when he says:-*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.14*

"And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter; should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isaiah 8:19, 20.SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.15*

Let us heed the admonition, that we "may be accounted worthy to escape all these things, and to stand before the Son of man."*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.16*

"A Critical Period" The Signs of the Times, 13, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

President Washburn, of Robert College, Constantinople, in a letter to the New York *Independent*, says of the European outlook: "On the whole, there are at least *six* chances out of *ten* that we shall have an outbreak of war within two months." "Bismarck was undoubtedly right when he asserted in his great speech before the Germany Parliament that another war between France and Germany was inevitable. France has never accepted the loss of her provinces, and the one thing that the Republic has steadily adhered to has been the policy of developing the army. It is now larger than that of Germany, and is rapidly reducing the Government to bankruptcy." He continues:-*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.17*

Russia will have to decide within a few weeks whether to strike now or to compromise with the Bulgarians and postpone her advance to a more favorable opportunity. It is hard to see how she can hope for amore promising chance than the present one. Germany and France are engaged in their own conflict. Austria is totally unprepared for war, and cannot possibly complete her preparations this spring. Turkey is bankrupt. England is absorbed in the Irish question, and her now democracy cares no more for Constantinople than for the man in the moon. Her Government is liable to be overturned any day, and cannot act with vigor on its own convictions. Italy is in the midst of a great political crisis. If war really breaks out between France and Germany, or if the present state of expectation of war continues, it would seem probable that the Czar will either attack Austria directly or occupy Bulgaria and put Montenegro forward to raise an insurrection in Bosnia and Herzegovina.*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.18*

It is undoubtedly the most critical moment that Europe has seen since 1815. It is not simply the fate of empires or the liberty of the Balkan Peninsular which is involved, but the civilization of the world. It is the crisis of that struggle to which Napoleon looked forward when he predicted that Europe would one day be either Cossack or Republican. Russia to-day makes no secret of her determination to overthrow "the rotten civilization of Western Europe" and to replace it by a new civilization of her own.*SITI April 14, 1887, page 240.19*

April 21, 1887

“Sunday Laws in Tennessee” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

As some of our readers may wish to know more about the defeat in the Tennessee Legislature, of the bill exempting conscientious observers of the seventh day, from certain provisions of the Sunday law, we submit a few facts gleaned from a recent letter from one of our brethren in that State:-*SITI April 21, 1887, page 245.1*

Senator Green, who only a few days before had made a speech against a bill which provided that railroad trains should not be allowed to run after 8 o'clock A.M. on Sunday, was asked to support the exemption bill, but refused, saying:-*SITI April 21, 1887, page 245.2*

“I think the majority should rule in regard to the Sabbath.” He also said of the bill pending in the Senate: “Should it pass, it would be a prolific and continual source of disturbance, for there would be in the same towns or neighborhoods some assembled on Sunday worshiping God, while just outside in the fields others would be plowing or doing other labor, and it could not but greatly disturb the consciences of the worships.”*SITI April 21, 1887, page 245.3*

Mr. Green was then reminded of his speech of a few days previous, and he was asked to reconcile his opposition to the bill exempting Sabbath-keepers from the provisions of the Sunday law with his plea in favor of Sunday railroading. To this he replied:-*SITI April 21, 1887, page 245.4*

“I am a stock-dealer, and know that should a train load of cattle be side-tracked all day Sunday the stock would suffer for food and water.”*SITI April 21, 1887, page 245.5*

The brethren then appealed to him in behalf of their families, stating that their conscientious convictions compelled them to keep the seventh day, and that if they were compelled by law to keep Sunday also, their families must suffer, for they could not support them properly on the proceeds of five days labor. “Now,” said they to the Senator, “is it more important that your cattle have relief, than that our families should have similar relief? All we ask is that we be allowed to work on Sunday for the support of our families, just as you allow the railroads to work for the relief of the cattle.” But their appeal fell on ears deaf to everything but self-interest, and the only reply was, “You can labor six days now if you will do it when other Christians do,” adding that he was in favor of the rights of conscience! Which evidently meant that he was in favor of very man enjoying liberty of conscience, always provided, however, that his conscience was just like the Senator’s conscience—a little elastic when powerful corporations and rich stock-dealers are concerned, but very rigid when only the just and natural rights of a conscientious Sabbath-keepers are at stake.*SITI April 21, 1887, page 245.6*

The chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Dr. Barbee, used his influence against the bill, urging that everybody ought to keep Sunday, because it is the law of the land, and the custom of the church. He thought that no one should set up his conscience against the law and custom. Such were some of the sophistries which were potent for the defeat of a bill granting religious liberty in Tennessee.*SITI April 21, 1887, page 245.7*

“The Unpardonable Sin. (Concluded.)” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

The same thing is brought to view in *Hebrews 10:26-29*: “For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries. He that despised Moses’ law died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?” *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.1*

Here we have presumptuous sin. The case recorded in *Numbers 15* is in point. The Lord had said that the soul which should do aught presumptuously, should be cut off, because he had “despised the word of the Lord, and hath broken his commandment.” *Verses 30, 31*. Then follows an instance of such a sin. A man went out to gather sticks on the Sabbath-day. He was not driven to do this by want, but he did it in willful violation of the commandment of the Lord, that everyone should abide in his place. He presumed on the mercy of the Lord. He knew the commandment, yet he deliberately tried the Lord, to see if he meant what he said. He found out to his cost that the Lord meant just what he said. He found out that the Lord cannot be trifled with. That was a case of willful sin, after having received the knowledge of the truth. It was not simply the fact that the man violated a commandment, for every error is a violation of some commandment, but the man violated the commandment deliberately and intentionally, knowing that his act was a violation of the commandment. In

other words, he “despised the word of the Lord.” *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.2*

Now, says Paul, if a man who deliberately violated a commandment had to die without mercy, and could have no atonement made for his sin, how much worse off must the man be who not only violates the commandments (for all have sinned), but who deliberately rejects the only means by which an atonement for sins can be made. Certainly his case is doubly hopeless. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.3*

Sinners against light always brings darkness. This is a self-evident truth. If a man rejects light, nothing but darkness remains. So our Saviour says to us, as ... to the Jews: “Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you; for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth.” *John 12:35*. And in like manner Paul says that Satan will, just before the coming of the Lord, work “with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.” *2 Thessalonians 2:9-12*. It will be just as it was with the heathen. Because when they knew God they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, therefore God gave them up to uncleanness; and “even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, and God gave them over to a mind void of judgment.” See *Romans 1:27-28*, margin. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.4*

Thus when one knows what is right, and deliberately chooses error, he soon loses the knowledge of what is right; it soon becomes impossible for sacred things to make any impression upon him; and if he does not know the right way, of course he cannot follow it. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.5*

The same idea that we have found in the two passages quoted from the book of Hebrews, is carried out in *Hebrews 12:15-17*, which reads thus: “Looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled; lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected; for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears.” *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.6*

In *Genesis 25:29-34* we find an account of the transaction to which the apostle refers. Esau bartered away his birthright for a mess of pottage. It was a deliberate transaction, and when the bargain was concluded it could not be altered. If a man makes a deliberate bargain, and sells a piece of property, he cannot back out. Esau sold his birthright for a paltry meal of victuals, thus showing that he despised, or did not appreciate, his birthright. Afterward he would have inherited a blessing, but he had sold it, and could not. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.7*

Thousands of men have repeated Esau’s course. Paul says of one of his co-laborers: “Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world.” *2 Timothy 4:10*. Here we have the case of Esau repeated. Esau sold his birthright, to satisfy a present need; Demas sold his interest in the cause of God and in eternal life, for this present world. Thousands of people acknowledge their duty to keep the Sabbath of the Lord, yet say, “If I should keep the Sabbath I couldn’t make a living,” and so for a mess of pottage, a few meals of victuals, they sell their heavenly inheritance. We have known people who felt that they couldn’t make a living if they kept the Sabbath, and who made up their minds that when they had secured a competency they would obey; but they never obeyed; they never afterwards could find a convenient time, and although they gained a competency, they never again could feel any special interest in the Sabbath. They had disbelieved God, and showed that they thought more of present enjoyment than of the enduring riches, and God gave them that which they prized most. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.8*

It is not necessary to pursue this subject further. Let the reader note that we have found at least four ways in which men may commit the unpardonable sin: 1. By deliberately attributing the work of the Spirit of God to the devil. 2. By refusing to yield to the strivings of the Spirit, until by continual sinning the heart becomes so hard that the Spirit can make no impression upon it, and a sense of sin is lost. Then it is said, “Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone.” 3. By falling from the grace of God, and deliberately rejecting Christ’s sacrifice. 4. By presuming upon God’s mercy, and deliberately transgressing his commandments, with our eyes open to the consequences, and a determination to see if God will bring them upon us. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.9*

Many people who have thought themselves guilty of the unpardonable sin, were not. For the encouragement of such we write. The man whose heart is broken at the thought of his sin against God, and who is tender and repentant, may find pardon, for “the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit;” a broken and a contrite heart the Lord will not despise. *Psalms 51:17*. Although a man’s sense of his sins may be so great that they seem to him unpardonable, he may rest assured that where sin abounds (that is, a sense of sin), grace does much more abound. *Romans 5:20*. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.10*

But it is also true that thousands are in danger of the unpardonable sin, who think themselves secure, and for

the warning of such we also write. The man who thinks that he may indulge *just once more* in some known sin which is very dear to him, may find that that was just once too often for pardon. No one can tell how weary the Spirit may be of striving with him, or how near he may be to the close of probation. Many men who were "going to reform," never did reform, because death came before they had gotten ready to reform. So there will doubtless be many well-intentioned persons lost, because they will weary the Spirit with their lukewarm dilatoriness, and probation will close before they have made up their minds to be wholly on the Lord's side. When it is too late, they will arouse, and will seek for the word of the Lord, but will not be able to find it. *Amos 8:11, 12. SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.11*

It is dangerous to sin at all. Our only hope of safety from falling into the unpardonable sin is to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and to "walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and increasing in the knowledge of God." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.12*

"To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near; let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." *W.SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.13*

"Present and Future Probation" The Signs of the Times, 13, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

In our comment on *Matthew 12:31, 32* in last week's SIGNS, we had designed to make a few remarks upon the last clause of the passage, but we could not do so without too much of a diversion from the subject under consideration. The part referred to reads thus: "But whosoever speaketh against against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." This especially of late years has been perverted to the support of a rapidly-growing theory which is subversive of the very foundation principles of the gospel of Christ. We refer to the theory of a probation after death. It is claimed that the clause, "it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come," teaches a probation after death; "for," say the advocates of this theory, "Christ would not say that a certain sin shall not be forgiven in the world to come, unless it is possible for some sins to be then forgiven." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.14*

So far as the passage in question is concerned, this matter may quickly be settled. The same thing is recorded by two other evangelists, and these parallel passages must determine the meaning of the expression in Matthew. Mark recorded it thus: "But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost *hath never forgiveness*, but is in danger of eternal damnation." *Mark 3:29*. The words "hath never forgiveness," express the meaning exactly. Someone may say that this does not disprove the theory of future probation; but the clause, "is in danger of eternal damnation," when rightly understood, shows that no thought of future probation is connected with the text. For all sin there is condemnation; whoever sins is condemned already. But this condemnation may not be lasting; if the guilty one accepts Christ, his condemnation may come to an end; for there is "no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." If, however, the sinner has committed the sin against the Holy Spirit, his condemnation is eternal; from it there is no possibility of escape. This is all that can be found in the text. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.15*

In further proof of this, we have the simple statement made by Luke. He says, "But unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost *it shall not be forgiven* him." *Luke 12:10*. This is just what the Saviour meant and all that he meant. He made an emphatic statement that the sin against the Holy Ghost should have no forgiveness; any attempt to make more out of his words is adding to the words of Inspiration. "Add thou not unto His words, lest He reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." *Proverbs 30:6. SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.16*

There are just two other texts in the Bible, which are quoted to uphold the future probation theory. These are *1 Peter 3:18-20; 4:6*. These texts should receive careful consideration, especially the first, for, as perverted, it is made the foundation of many unscriptural theories. We will quote the text in full: *-SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.17*

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 246.18*

The simplest way to show what the text does not mean, is to show what it does mean. This we may do by a series of questions which will enable the reader himself to explain its meaning. Thus: *-SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.1*

1. Who once suffered? *Answer*—"Christ also hath once suffered." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.2*
2. For what did Christ suffer? *Ans*—"For sins." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.3*
3. Why did he thus suffer? *Ans*—"That he might bring us to God." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.4*
4. How did he suffer? *Ans*—"Being put to death in the flesh." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.5*
5. By what was he quickened, or made alive? *Ans*—"Quickened [made alive] by the Spirit." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.6*
6. What else did he do by the Spirit? *Ans*—"He went and preached unto the spirits in prison." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.7*
7. Why were they in prison? *Ans*—"They "sometime [once] were disobedient." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.8*
8. When were they disobedient and in prison? *Ans*—"When once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.9*

There is the whole matter stated in the words of Scripture, so plainly that the most obtuse could not fail to see it. These disobedient spirits were in prison in the days of Noah, and therefore it was at that time that the preaching was done to them. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.10*

Note the harmony between this text and *Genesis 6:3*. This text says, that Christ, by the Spirit, went and preached to the spirits in prison, "When once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah." This would imply that in the days of Noah, God had waited a long time for something. Now read *Genesis 6:3*: "And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." Here we find that God's longsuffering waited one hundred and twenty years, to give those wicked people a chance to repent. All that time Christ, by the Spirit, was preaching to them. Noah was the visible agent, but he was simply the mouthpiece, just as Paul says of all true preachers, they are "ambassadors for Christ," saying to sinners, "We pay you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." *2 Corinthians 5:20. SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.11*

Here we might leave this subject, but someone will probably be questioning about the prison, and we may as well forestall the queries. By gross perversion of Scripture, it is assumed that this prison was *hades*, and that the preaching was done there. Indeed, many would-be expositors write as though this were expressly stated in the text. In the next number we shall show clearly why such an assumption is absurd, and how it would have been impossible for Christ, or anybody else, to preach in *hades*, for that subject is worthy of an article by itself. We shall now be content to show what the imprisonment was, which is mentioned in the text. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.12*

The reader will bear in mind that these "spirits in prison" were disobedient. Now disobedience brings condemnation to death (*Romans 6:23*), and a man under sentence of death is always kept in prison. This is the idea conveyed by the psalmist when he says: "From Heaven did the Lord behold the earth; to hear the groaning of the prisoners; to loose those that are appointed to death." *Psalms 102, 19, 20*. And the idea is still more forcibly expressed by the apostle, when he says that Christ took part of flesh and blood, "that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them, who *through fear of death* were all their lifetime *subject to bondage*." *Hebrews 2:14, 15. SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.13*

Nothing but sin causes fear of death; hence the text teaches emphatically that sin makes men "subject to bondage." It is the especial mission of Christ to save people from sin (*Matthew 1:21*), and consequently to release them from prison. For proof of this read the following texts:- *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.14*

Isaiah 61:1: "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.15*

Isaiah 42:1-7: "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon him; ... to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.16*

Notice that Christ proclaims the opening of the prison to them that are bound, and brings out the prisoners from the prison, because the Spirit is upon him. This agrees with Peter's statement that Christ, by the Spirit, went and preached to the spirits in prison. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.17*

Psalms 116:16: "O Lord, truly I am thy servant; I am thy servant, and the son of thine handmaid; thou hast

loosed my bonds." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.18*

Psalm 142:7: "Bring my soul out of prison, that I may praise thy name." SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.19

Psalm 79:11: "Let the sighing of the prisoner come before thee; according to the greatness of thy power preserve thou those that are appointed to die." Compare Psalm 102:19, 20; Hebrews 2:16. SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.20

To this might be added our Saviour's talk to the Jews, recorded in the eighth of John. He told them how they might be made free. *Verse 32*. They denied that they were in bondage. *Verse 33*. He told them that "whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin" (*verse 34*), and therefore in bondage. Compare *Romans 6:16-18; 7:14; 2 Peter 2:19*. He then told them that the Son alone could make them free indeed. *Verse 36*. Yet although Christ was there, filled with the same Spirit by which he preached to the wicked antediluvians, these Jews, like them, refused to be set free, and died in their sins. *Verse 21. SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.21*

With this we leave the text, *1 Peter 3:18-20*, believing that anyone with whom simple Bible statements are all-sufficient evidence, will have no difficulty in seeing that it teaches this; that by the same Spirit by which Christ was raised from the dead, he went in the days of Noah, and through him, preached unto the antediluvians, who were in the bondage of sin; and that in so doing he was simply doing what he is doing to-day, and has been doing ever since the fall. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.22*

This work of Christ, of preaching deliverance to the captives, is limited to this present life, for when he comes the second time he comes "without sin unto salvation," to take the released prisoners home. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.23*

Therefore, "To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts;" for, "behold now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." *W. SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.24*

"Christian Science" The Signs of the Times, 13, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

This is a very innocent name, and one well calculated to impress many people favorably. The word "science" is in itself sufficient to overawe the multitude, for so great is the reverence for science that a bundle of the veriest nonsense will pass current, if it is only labeled "scientific;" and when to this is prefixed the word "Christian," to say anything derogatory would be thought sacrilegious. The term is used to designate "the greatest remedial system ever employed to eradicate pain and disease." As a matter of fact, it is the name of the most unchristian and antichristian nonsense that has lately been invented to deceive people. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.25*

According to one of its most intelligent advocates, "It is very necessary to impress upon the novice in the science that we are created spiritually as well as physically, and that the body is not the real self." After this Spiritualistic utterance, we are prepared to learn that, "There is no death. You are created as a spiritual being, and you cannot get away. What we call death is merely a cessation of the action of the mind on the body. The body is now dead, and it is merely animated by the action of the mind." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.26*

Of course if there is no death, there is no disease, and this "Christian Science" consists in deluding people with this idea. If a man has a broken leg, these "Scientists" will not heal it, but will argue something like this: "Your body is no part of yourself. You are a spiritual being, and a spiritual leg cannot be broken, consequently your leg is not broken. That which you call your leg, and which is broken, has nothing more to do with you than though it was a stick that was broken." But with all this "reasoning," they would not be able to induce the man to so ignore his real broken leg as to walk upon his spiritual leg. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.27*

As an evidence of the anti-Christian character of this so-called "science," we need only state that the president of a "Christian Science College" in Chicago, says that the works of Christ and his disciples "were not supernatural, nor miracles, as is generally supposed, but could be performed by anyone whose knowledge and faith in Christian Science would enable him to do it." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.28*

This "Christian Science," or Mind Cure, is simply a phase of Spiritualism. That it will ere long have many followers, there can be no question, for it is based solely on the pagan notion of the immortality of the soul, and that the body is no part of the real man; and a belief of this is nowadays quite generally considered as evidence that one is a Christian. And it is for this reason that Spiritualism is arrogating to itself the name Christian, with good prospects that it will not be long before its claims are recognized by the remainder of the "Christian world." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 247.29*

"Where Are They?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

"Where are the saints that rose from the dead at the time of Christ's resurrection? Did they return to their graves, or are they in Heaven? Where are Enoch and Elijah? O. B. H." *SITI April 21, 1887, page 248.1*

The Bible tells us that "Elijah went up by a whirlwind into Heaven." *2 Kings 2:11*. Of Enoch it says that he "was translated that he should not see death" (*Hebrews 11:5*), and that "God took him." *Genesis 5:24*. So there can be no question but that he too is in Heaven. We are not told positively what became of those whose graves were opened at the death of Christ, and who came out of the graves after his resurrection (*Matthew 27:50-53*), but the evidence seems to indicate quite clearly that they, too, are now in Heaven. Thus Paul says of Christ (*Ephesians 4:8*, margin) that "when he ascended upon high, he led a multitude of captives, and gave gifts unto men." Since Christ himself is in Heaven (*1 Peter 3:22*), it is evident that those whom he led with him from captivity are there too. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 248.2*

If we turn to *Revelation 5:9, 10* we shall find a company brought to view who have been redeemed from among men, by the blood of Christ, who are around the throne of God. That this is not a prophetic view of what shall take place after the coming of the Lord, is proved by the fact that at the same time there stood in the midst the "Lamb as it had been slain." Now since men can get to Heaven before the coming of the Lord only by a special resurrection or translation, we are warranted in concluding that these saints who were raised at the resurrection of Christ, are identical with those whom John saw in Heaven. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 248.3*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

The steamer *Mariposa*, which arrived April 16, from Australia, brought Elder J. O. Corliss and family. Elder Corliss is quite feeble in health, and was obliged to cease labor in the midst of the best interest there has been in that field. He will go to the health retreat at St. Helena for treatment. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 256.1*

Since fifty numbers of the SIGNS constitutes a volume, there are necessarily two weeks in the year in which no paper is printed, and our custom has always been to have one of these weeks the week of the annual meetings. Accordingly, the next number of the SIGNS-No. 17-will be issued May 5, instead of April 28. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 256.2*

The article on this page, entitled "Sunday Legislation in Massachusetts," although none too long, is no longer than we usually put on this page; but it arrived after the body of the paper had been made up, and we could not let matter of so great interest and importance, lay over for two weeks. We expect that our correspondent will give us, in our next issue, the outcome of the matter in the Senate. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 256.3*

A man in Kansas takes exceptions to our teaching that the Sabbath should still be kept holy, and says: "How a man lives is the only possible criterion to judge by. Right conduct is the only orthodoxy." We agree, and would inform our critic that whether or not a man keeps the Sabbath, has a good deal to do with his life. It is quite essential to right conduct that he keep the Sabbath, for so the Lord commands. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 256.4*

One of our exchanges remarks that in view of the political influence which recent events in Germany have demonstrated that the Pope can exercise the question of who will be the next Pope is invested with an additional interest. That may be; but as a matter of fact, it makes very little difference who is Pope; for whoever he may be he represents the Papacy; and as has been said: "It often happens that the man who goes into the Vatican with progressive ideas, falls under the almost irresistible traditions of the place, and becomes the exponent of Catholic ideas of the irreconcilable type." The Papacy always has meddled and always will meddle in politics; and the influence of the Pope, whoever he may be, will always be exerted in the interests of Romanism first, last, and all the time. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 256.5*

The *Christian Nation*, one of the organs of the National Reform Association, whose chief aim is to have the United States Constitution so amended that Sunday observance can be enforced upon all people, regardless of their position or religious belief, quotes with approval from Dr. Talmage's recent discourse on the "Abolition of the Sabbath," in which he says:- *SITI April 21, 1887, page 256.6*

"Oh! say some, 'haven't you any regard for the people's rights?' I believe in the people having their rights; but has not the Lord any rights? You govern your family, and the Governor rules the State, and the President rules the United States. Do you really think the Lord Almighty, who made the heavens and the earth, has a right to rule the universe?" *SITI April 21, 1887, page 256.7*

Indeed we do; but we don't believe that any man or any body of men has that right. What we object to in the

National Reform Association is that it proposes, in reality to take the reins of Government out of the Lord's hands. We prefer to fall into the hands of the Lord than into the hands of man. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 256.8*

A man in Kansas has written a pamphlet of 104 pages, expressly for the purpose of proving that the Sabbath of the fourth commandment should not be kept. Having exhausted all the arguments that he could think of, against the Sabbath, he turns his attention to those who keep the day, affirming that everything that none are induced to keep it, except those who grasp everything that is new, and who "will change that for something else as soon as the tide shall run some other way." He says that "they are white clouds having no rain, and are, therefore, carried about with every wind of doctrine." The query with us is why he should spend so much time and strength arguing against a practice which is adopted only by those who he says cannot be influenced by argument. *SITI April 21, 1887, page 256.9*

May 5, 1887

"Something Not Commanded" The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

A friend has sent us a copy of the *Cambridge News*, published at Cambridgeboro, Penn., which contains the synopsis of a discourse on the Sabbath, preached by Rev. Wm. Grassic, of that place. After showing the origin of the Sabbath, its place in the decalogue, its sacredness, and the fact that Christ did not abolish it, but that "Jesus left the Sabbath a more solemnly binding and sacred institution than he found it," he proceeds as follows:-*SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.1*

"Come now to the apostles. While under the special influence of the Holy Ghost, planting churches, carrying on revivals, starting missionary enterprises, they changed the time of observance from the seventh to the first day of the week. We believe they were divinely inspired to make the change, and yet wisely directed to make no public decree about it!"*SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.2*

Well, now, here's a conundrum. If the apostles were inspired to make the change in the Sabbath, and yet were "wisely directed" to keep the fact from the public, how did the Rev. Wm. Grassic find it out? We take it for granted that he was not there to see for himself, since what he tells about must have happened fully eighteen hundred years ago. How did he learn of this change? How did the fact leak out? As Mr. Grassic admits, the Scriptures are utterly silent respecting the change.*SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.3*

Just think of it! The apostle divinely directed to make a change in that institution which God had made and sanctified at creation, and which he had made known at Sinai in thunder tones which shook the earth, and yet cautioned to tell nobody of the change! The statement is so absurd that it refutes itself. The fact that ministers of the gospel are driven to such shifts to account for the present Sunday observance, is sufficient evidence that such observance has not the slightest sanction of inspiration. The Lord does not work in so underhanded a manner. We are told that he will do nothing without revealing his secret unto his servants the prophets (*Amos 3:7*), and he makes known his will to the prophets in order that they may tell the people.*SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.4*

Notice also that Mr. Grassic claims expressly that the change of the Sabbath was not effected in the days of Christ, but that he "left the Sabbath a more solemnly binding and sacred institution than he found it." Then if, as he claims, the apostles had made the change, they would have gone directly contrary to the teaching and practice of Christ. If this claim were true, whom should we follow? Should we follow Christ, or the apostles? He, of course, would have us follow the apostles, and thus we see that in order to find a basis for Sunday observance, men are willing to ignore Christ. We do not propose to ignore either Christ or his apostles, for all taught the same thing. They never presumed to do more than to follow their Master. "The servant is not greater than his Lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him."*SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.5*

One point more: Mr. Grassic tells us that the apostles were "wisely directed to make no public decree" about the change of the Sabbath. That is to say that there was no command given for the observance of Sunday. Now read Webster's definition of superstition: "Extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious *rites not commanded*." Then according to the common usage of language, and Mr. Grassic's own admission, we must conclude that the observance of Sunday is nothing but superstition; and the more rigidly its observance is enforced, the more superstition is evinced. How much better it would be to follow the plain commandment of God, even though the world oppose, than to ignore Christ and the Bible in an attempt to find an excuse for following the custom of the multitude. It seems to us that thinking people should need no stronger proof of the falsity of the claims of Sunday, than the excuses which its devotees put forth in its behalf. *W. SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.6*

"The Lord's Prayer. Forgive Us Our Debts" The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

"Forgive Us Our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors."*SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.7*

This may be called the crowning petition in this wonderful prayer. In the beginning of these comments we said that this prayer is only for those who have given themselves to Christ, who can truly say "Our Father." This proves that still more plainly. We do not mean that it is for none but those who are perfect, but that it is for those who have surrendered themselves to the Lord that he may work in them both to will and to do of his good pleasure. To be able always to pray understandingly and from the heart, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors," is something that can be done by but comparatively few who profess to be Christians. The one who can do it is in possession of the greatest of all Christian graces-charity; for "charity suffereth

long, and is kind," "is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil," and this is the way we would be to have the Lord deal with us. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.8*

A great many people think that they are of a forgiving disposition when they are not. When they have done wrong, and someone takes revenge on them, they think that they are deserving of considerable credit if they can take it patiently; but they think that they are perfectly justifiable in harboring harsh thoughts, at least, if they are injured without cause. This is indicated by the common saying, "If I had done anything to deserve this treatment, I would not say anything; but I have not done anything, and I won't stand it." That is as far from the forgiveness that our Saviour taught, as the east is from the west. "For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? But if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God." *1 Peter 2:20. SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.9*

It has been truly said that to forgive is divine. Certainly it is not human. Human nature knows nothing of forgiveness. Human nature stands upon its dignity, and says, "I'll have my rights; nobody shall trample on me with impunity." But the divine Son of God, who did no sin, and in whose mouth was found no guile, "when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously." *1 Peter 2:23*. You who say, "All I ask is simple justice; I demand only my rights," how would you fare if you should go immediately after such an assertion and repeat the Lord's prayer, and the Lord should take you at your word? Who could stand if the Lord should mark iniquity? Suppose the Lord should give you simple justice,—just what you deserve, and nothing more,—what would be the result? Not only would you be deprived of eternal life, but your present life would not be continued for another moment; for there is not one of us who deserves a single blessing from the hand of God; "it is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not." *Lamentations 3:22*. There is in us no good thing; we have all gone out of the way, and are unprofitable (*Romans 3:10-12*); now when our rights have been invaded, and we cherish resentment, we cannot utter the Lord's prayer without asking the Lord not to forgive us. What a terrible thing it is not to have a forgiving spirit. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.10*

Nor can we avoid the consequence above indicated, by refusing to use our Saviour's prayer. Whether we ask or not, we shall be forgiven just as we forgive. Says the Saviour: "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." *Matthew 6:14, 15. SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.11*

We have said that forgiveness is not natural to the human heart. Only to the extent that one is partaker of the divine nature, can he exercise true forgiveness. God's forgiveness is the standard for us. Says Paul: "And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you." *Ephesians 4:32*. No one can know how to forgive, unless he knows how God forgives; and nobody can fully understand how God forgives, until he has felt in his own soul the fullness of divine pardon. It will be worth our while to note a few texts which show how God forgives, so that we may know what spirit we should have. Let us read a few texts:—*SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.12*

"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." *John 3:16*. "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." *Romans 5:8*. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." *1 Peter 3:18*. "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." "We love him, because he first loved us." *1 John 4:9, 10, 19. SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.13*

We have heard it claimed that we are not required to forgive an offender unless he asks for forgiveness; that until he repents and begs for pardon, we are warranted in holding him off. But the above texts convey a different idea. We are to forgive as God forgives. Now suppose that God had made no movement towards the salvation of rebellious men until they humbled themselves before him; there never would have been any salvation for men. It is only because of his love for us while we were rebels, that we are enabled to come to him. He was under no obligation to mankind; the obligation was all on the other side; yet he took the initiative. God loved the world. He harbored no malice or enmity in his heart, because he had been insulted, and his laws trampled upon, but was filled with love and pity for poor, erring mortals. It grieved him to think that man would pursue a course that would inevitably end in his ruin, and he made the way easy for him to return to his allegiance, and begged him to come and be forgiven. The same spirit should actuate us. No matter how much we may have been misused, we are not warranted in entertaining the slightest feeling of enmity toward the offender. On the contrary, we should have such love for him that our only feeling would be that of sorrow that he should pursue a course so detrimental to himself. The thought of the personal injury we have sustained should be lost sight of in the thought of the greater injury which the offender's course will bring upon himself. It is not natural for us to do this; we can do it only when we are partakers of the divine nature. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.14*

It may be said that God does not actually forgive men until they repent. This is true; but he desires that they shall receive his pardon, and therefore, so far as he is concerned, he has pardoned them. All that is lacking is for them to accept the pardon which he offers them; if they will not, he is clear, and the responsibility of their ruin rests upon themselves. God could not actually pardon an unrepentant sinner, for the reason that when he pardons it means far more than when we forgive. If a man has maliciously injured us, and we forgive him, it makes no difference with his guilt; but when God forgives the sinner, his guilt is by that pardon taken away; and it is evident that God cannot take away the guilt of a man who has no desire nor intention to abstain from his sins, but who is determined to retain his guilty practices. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.15*

This brings us to another feature of forgiveness. It is very common for people to say that they can forgive but they cannot forget. That is not true forgiveness. The man who does not forget the injury, will brood over it until the bitter feelings will come up again with more than their original force; the harsh feelings are not put away, but only smothered for a time. The man who does not forget an injury done him, has never really forgiven the offender; he has not allowed love for the erring one to eclipse all thought of the injury done to himself, and without this there can be no forgiveness such as God exercises toward us. Divine pardon is justification; God pardons the believer in Christ, by imputing his righteousness "for the remission of sins that are past." The pardoned one is as though he had never sinned; where there was nothing but guilt before, God beholds nothing but righteousness, -righteousness put there through his own wonderful love. Then if we forgive as God forgives, we must regard the repentant offender as though he had done nothing against us. We must forget that he ever injured us. We must treat him and regard him as though he had done us nothing but good instead of nothing but evil. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 262.16*

The man who forgives in this manner is a true disciple of Christ, because no one can do this unless he has experienced, and does at the time experience, the blessing of divine forgiveness. It is not enough that we have once been forgiven; we must have a vivid sense of the love of God toward us *now*, if we would not forgive as we ought. Under these circumstances the most difficult thing in the world to do, becomes the easiest. Because when we realize how sinful we are, and how much God has forgiven us, it seems a small matter in comparison to forgive the petty wrong done us by a fellow-man. When we contemplate the magnitude of our sin against God, all the wrongs that all men may have done to us, sink into insignificance. We think that the servant who had received a free gift of ten thousand talents from his lord was mean and ungrateful because he would not give his fellow-servant one hundred pence. If he had any sense of what had been done for him, he would have told his fellow-servant to keep the paltry sum, and would have thought no more about it. So if we have any just sense of God's love to us, we cannot fail to exhibit corresponding love to our fellows. *W. SITI May 5, 1887, page 263.1*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

We call the attention of our readers to the above list of camp-meetings. These are but the beginning of the many that will be held this year. Others will be added to this list, as soon as the time and place of holding them are determined. There is considerable prejudice in many quarters against camp meetings, but all who are situated so that they can attend any one of these meetings, will find it to their interest and profit to do so. At all of them visitors will be welcomed and provided for. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.1*

Of the meetings just held in Oakland, we have space for but few words. It was more largely attended, and was in many respects the most interesting, of any ever held here. The Spirit of the Lord was present, as many can testify. That much good was done there cannot be the slightest doubt; we pray that its effects may be permanent. Important steps were proposed and voted, looking to the advancement of the work. These will be set forth next week in the reports, which, owing to the shortness of the time, could not be furnished for this week's paper. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.2*

The friends of the cause in the North Pacific and Upper Columbia Conferences, should not fail to attend camp-meeting this spring. In addition to the strong preaching force sent by the General Conference, Brother F. M. Morrison, of the Pacific Press, will attend both these meetings for the purpose of giving instruction to those who wish to engage in the work of canvassing. He is a practical canvassers and teacher, and will render efficient service in this branch. We shall be greatly disappointed if some who think themselves incapable of work, do not at these meetings resolve to give their entire time to it. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.3*

In the *Independent* of April 7, President Washburn, of Robert College, Constantinople, said of the situation in Bulgaria:-*SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.4*

"There seems to be a general impression that we shall have no war this year.... But thus far, from the standpoint of Constantinople, I can see no evidence that the danger has passed. Nothing has been settled. Every cause of war which existed two months ago exists still. Preparations for war are still going on as

vigorously as ever, and the relations of Russia with Austria, Turkey, and England are no more friendly. In some directions they are more strained. If the Czar feels that he is ready for war this spring, it will come." *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.5*

In his report to the Roman Propaganda, concerning the Knights of Labor, Cardinal Gibbons contrasts the religious devotion of the working classes of this country with the religious hostility of the same class in foreign countries, and says that the Catholic workmen of America "are intelligent, instructed, devoted sons, ready to give their blood as they give their means," for the support of the church. As the *Observer* says, if this assertion means anything, it means that the Pope's minions in this country are ready to fight for him if need be; that they never become so devoted to any society, not even to their adopted country, that they would not fight at the call of one who blasphemously professes to be head of the church. When it is too late, some who are indifferent now, will realize that while Roman Catholicism is nominally a religious system, it is primarily a political power, bent on destroying everything that it cannot rule. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.6*

The *Christian at Work* tells us that "fasting is peculiarly an Old Testament institution, and as out of place as we are told new wine is in an old wineskin." Yet Christ, in the sermon on the mount, said: "Moreover when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance; for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward. But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face; that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father in secret shall reward thee openly." *Matthew 6:16-18*. And while this institution of the Bible-both Old and New Testaments-is summarily set aside, Papal holidays, such as "Holy Thursday," Good Friday, Easter, Christmas, Sundays, etc., are coming to be generally observed. Alas for the exchange of real Old and New Testament religion, for those things which are not commanded! *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.7*

"Falsifying the balances by deceit," is one of the most common things nowadays. An experiment was recently made in Brooklyn, N. Y., with a view of ascertaining whether the coal dealers of that city were in the habit of defrauding their customers. Eighty-two tons of coal, bought of several dealers, were weighed after delivery, and only sixteen of them were of full weight. The remainder showed short weight, some to the amount of thirty pounds, and some as high as three hundred and twenty-six pounds. It is not to be supposed that Brooklyn coal dealers are very much worse than coal dealers in other cities, or that coal dealers are worse by nature than other men; but iniquity abounds, and it is with feelings of sadness only, that we recognize the fact that the great majority of men feel no compunctions of conscience against defrauding when they are reasonably sure that they will escape detection. Thank God that there are still many honest men in the world; and since we cannot judge the motives of any, we should labor in love for the salvation of all. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.8*

The following, which has just appeared in an Austrian paper, is very significant:- *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.9*

"The Vatican favors the following conditions for a reconciliation with the Quiritual: 1. The Pope will advise the royal archducal and ducal families of Naples, Tuscany, and Nicodeaux to renounce all claims to sovereignty in favor of the Holy See. 2. The Pope will crown Humbert king, granting him and his Catholic descendants territory alone in Italy. 3. The king will govern the whole kingdom with full temporal rights, but will acknowledge the Pope as suzerain and pledge himself to rule according to the dictates of the church. 4. The king will reside at Rome. 5. Territory, including Leonine City and part of the Tiber shore, will be allotted permanently to the Pope, with absolute ruling and proprietary right. 6. A special convention will be concluded, fixing the amount Italy shall pay to maintain the Papal household." *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.10*

That means the absolute supremacy of the Pope over all Italy, the king being nominal ruler, but really the Pope's vassal. Whether or not Humbert is really for peace on these terms, remains to be seen, but that he will sooner or later accede in order to get the Pope's assistance in some difficulty, as Bismarck has done, there can be no doubt. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.11*

A bill restricting railroad traffic on Sunday has been passed by the Connecticut Legislature, and has received the governor's signature. Hereafter no trains can be run for any purpose whatever between 10:30 A.M. and three P. M. Before and after these hours only mail trains, or those required for public necessity, for the preservation of freight, will be allowed to run. The law also prohibits the landing of freight from sunrise to sunset on Sunday. We have serious doubts as to its being enforced. *SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.12*

"The Pope in Politics" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

The Pope, though nominally without a vestige of temporal power, keeps up most assiduously the forms of civil sovereignty, and his influence is stronger to-day than it has ever been since his temporary overthrow in 1798. When he was elevated to the Pontificate, Leo XIII., was not supposed to be possessed of any great political

ability; but he seems to have inherited all the instincts and traditions of the "holy office," and he has certainly shown himself to be a master in diplomacy; for, though without a foot of territory that he can call his own, or a single subject who rightfully owes him civil allegiance, he is recognized as a sovereign and treated with on terms of equality by almost all the powers of earth, not even excepting the Turks, the traditional enemies of Rome, and the Chinese, the disciples of Confucius.*SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.13*

But the end is not yet; for, if we may trust the newspaper reports, the crafty Leo will soon appoint a nuncio to the United States! At first thought this seems hardly credible; but stranger things have happened, and in view of the honors shown by this Government, some months since, to the Pope's delegates who came to Baltimore to confer upon a citizen of this country a princely title and a Papal decoration, it is to be feared that a nuncio would be received at Washington. It is true that such an action would be most ill-advised and unfortunate; but as the Roman Catholic vote in this country is sufficiently large to at least render probable the defeat of any man or party particularly obnoxious to "the church," it is not likely that the President would have the moral courage to refuse to receive a Papal minister, should one be appointed.*SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.14*

But whether the nuncio comes just now or not, the Papacy is ere long to make its power felt as never before in American politics; and how easily this may be done is well exemplified by recent events in Germany. However, if Protestants were true to themselves and to their professed principles, we would have nothing to fear from the intrigues of Popery, but with Romanism on the one hand, and National Reform on the other, we may well tremble, for when the two unite, as they will ere long, for the destruction of our free institutions, religious liberty in this country will be a thing of the past.*SITI May 5, 1887, page 272.15*

May 12, 1887

"Can Inanimate Objects Talk?" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

"EDITOR SIGNS OF THE TIMES: Sometime last year I asked you the following questions:
SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.1

"Would it not be wrong, in teaching by allegory or parable, to use one founded on a superstition or false conception of facts, without showing its falsity? Did our Saviour ever use such an allegory or parable?"
SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.2

"You replied:-*SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.3*

"An answer to the second question would render the first unnecessary; for if Christ did make use of such a parable it would be evidence that the thing was not wrong. We have no knowledge, however, that our Saviour ever based any of his teachings on superstitions or false theories. The story of the rich man and Lazarus is not strictly a parable, but an apologue, like that found in *Judges 9:7-15*. An apologue is the relation of supposed actions of brutes or inanimate objects, and does not convey any wrong impression, because the hearers, knowing that the things referred to cannot do or say the things credited to them, readily understand that some moral truth is intended to be impressed by it."*SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.4*

"To this I made a brief reply at the time, but as it failed to reach you, I will by request restate some of my objections to your answer.*SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.5*

"In the first place, you say: 'If Christ did make use of such a parable it would be evidence that the thing was not wrong' as if it would be right under some circumstances to do wrong-for the teaching of false doctrine, if only by implication, is certainly wrong. This position is not a good one. But you say you have no knowledge he ever so taught. Neither have I. You call the story of the rich man and Lazarus an 'apologue.' Was it one to the Jews? Certainly not. They believed in the conscious existence of the soul (or spirit) after death, and this story, being based on that belief, had to them all the elements of probability-a parable-and would surely tend to confirm them in it. If this is an apologue it stands alone as such among all of Christ's teachings. Even an apologue should have some foundation in fact as Jotham's did in the olive, fig, vine, and bramble. W. M. B."*SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.6*

To the above we have to say: 1. We did not imply that it would ever be right to do wrong. What we did say was that Christ could not do wrong, and that therefore the fact that a certain thing was done by him, would be sufficient evidence that such act was not wrong. But in that case we should not be able to find anything in the word of God to condemn such action. In the case under consideration, however, we find no evidence that Christ ever used such a method of conveying instruction, and we do find that he could not have done such a thing, for it would have been a sort of deception.*SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.7*

2. Our correspondent begs the question entirely, when he says that the Jews "believed in the conscious existence of the soul after death, and this story [of the rich man and Lazarus], being based on that belief, had to them all the elements of probability." In order to show that the story of the rich man and Lazarus had to the Jews all the elements of probability, our friend ought to *prove* that they believed in the immortality of the soul, which he simply *assumes*. There is not the slightest evidence in the Bible to show that the Jews, as a people, believed in the conscious existence of the soul after death. Without doubt many of them had become so tainted with Grecian philosophy, from their contact with the heathen world, that they had come to believe in the existence of the soul after death; but the sacred writings of the Jews-the Old Testament-give not the slightest warrant for such a belief, and as a people the Jews still clung, outwardly at least, to the religion of their fathers. Therefore it is entirely an assumption to say that the Jews would either gain wrong ideas, or have erroneous views strengthened, by Christ's teaching in *Luke 16:19-31*.*SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.8*

3. Our correspondent says: "Even an apologue should have some foundation in fact, as Jotham's did in the olive, fig, vine, and bramble." What foundation in fact did Jotham's story of the olive, etc., have? Is it true that the trees ever went forth to anoint a king over them? and did anybody in the world ever hear an olive-tree, a fig-tree, a vine, or a bramble utter speech. No; Jotham's story had not the slightest foundation in fact. Was it therefore calculated to deceive, and to lead the people to think that trees do really talk. Not by any means; for his hearers well knew that it is contrary to nature that inanimate things should talk; they knew that he was using an imaginary instance to illustrate his case, and they saw the point at once.*SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.9*

So in the case of our Saviour. To illustrate a point he put words into the mouths of dead men. But the Jews

knew, both from observation and from their acquaintance with the Scriptures, that it is impossible for dead men to talk or think. They understood the point intended to be conveyed, just as well as the men of Shechem did the words of Jotham; and they were no more likely to imagine from Christ's words that dead men can talk, than the men of Shechem were to conclude from Jotham's words that trees can talk. For a dead man to talk would be as contrary to nature as it would be for trees. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.10*

The only way we can understand our friend's statement that Jotham's apologue had a foundation in fact, is to suppose that he means to say that in Jotham's time there were such things as trees, vines, and brambles. Well, so there were such things as dead men in Christ's time. And so the parallel between the two illustrations is perfect. Neither Jotham nor Christ taught that inanimate objects can talk, and nobody was deceived. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.11*

It is very common for people to read their own beliefs into the Bible. Because the majority of the people of the world believe that the soul of man exists after death, they take it for granted that the Jews always believed so, and that the Bible so teaches. Taken as it reads, and allowed to explain itself, the Bible bears very emphatic testimony against the pagan anomaly of a man being alive when he is dead. *W.SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.12*

"Women in the Church" The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

We are asked by a subscriber in Washington Territory to explain how the usages of Seventh-day Adventists, and of many other religious bodies as well, can be harmonized with *1 Corinthians 14:34, 35*, and *1 Timothy 2:11, 12*. He asks: "Were these commands transient? if so, when did they cease to be binding, and by what authority?" He also asks if *1 Corinthians 14:34, 35*, is correctly translated in Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul." *SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.13*

To the last question we would reply that the Authorized Version gives the sense of the text as well as can be done, and is more nearly literal than is Conybeare and Howson's rendering. The question on the text itself is worthy of consideration, for many good people think that the Bible forbids women to take part in public religious service. *1 Corinthians 14:34, 35*, reads as follows: *SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.14*

"Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." *SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.15*

It is worthy of mention that those who are most bitterly opposed to women's taking part in public service, are inconsistent with their own interpretation of this text. They interpret it to mean that women should never speak in public, either to preach, or to bear testimony in prayer-meeting; yet there is not a church in the land which does not have women singers, and in many of them the singing would greatly languish if it were not for the women. Now it is certain that those who sing do not "keep silence." We do not think that this is wrong, not a violation of Paul's injunction; we cite this instance merely for the purpose of showing the inconsistency of those who interpret Paul's words as prohibiting speaking in meeting, but allowing singing. Now if the injunction to "keep silence" does not prohibit singing, it is reasonable to suppose that it does not prohibit speaking at proper times and in a proper manner, for simple speaking is far more nearly an approach to silence than is ordinary singing. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.16*

And this we shall find to be the case, when we consider a few other texts; for we must always let scripture explain scripture. Read the other text to which our correspondent referred, *1 Timothy 2:11, 12*: "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." This must certainly be considered as parallel to, and explanatory of, *1 Corinthians 14:34, 35*. But there is nothing in it which would stop a woman from bearing testimony in social meeting, or even from preaching. Notice that Paul says: "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over a man," the idea being of a women's setting herself up as superior, and assuming authority which does not belong to her. But a simple testimony for Christ is the farthest removed from the assumption of authority, and even the preacher who usurps authority over his hearers, is out of place. The place of the preacher is not to be a lord over God's heritage, but to act the part of an ambassador for Christ. From the two texts quoted we must conclude that Paul did not mean to prohibit women from witnessing publicly for Christ, but only to have them act with becoming modesty. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.17*

This conclusion is made positive by other texts. In *1 Corinthians 11:4, 5, 13*, the same apostle says: "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head; for that is even all one as if she were shaven." "Judge in yourselves; is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered?" *SITI May 12, 1887, page*

In these verses, and the context, the apostle is giving directions for the proper conducting of public worship. Now if in *chapter 14* he meant to teach that women should utter no sound in public service, why did he here give directions concerning their praying and speaking in public assemblies? Certainly no directions are needed for the performance of that which is forbidden, and the fact that Paul tells how women should pray and prophesy in public meeting, shows that such action was not forbidden. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.19*

To forbid women any of the *privileges* of the gospel would be utterly at variance with the spirit of the gospel. Says Paul: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." *Galatians 3:27, 28*. That means that in the gospel plan there is no difference made for race, condition, or sex. A woman stands before God a sinner, just the same as a man; she is responsible for her own sins, and, if saved, must be saved in exactly the same way that a man is. No Christian would think of prohibiting a person from taking part in meeting, on the ground that he is a servant, or because he is of a different nationality from the majority of the members of the church; then no Christian should prevent a person from speaking to the praise of God, because that person is a woman. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.20*

To interpret Paul's language in *1 Corinthians 14:34, 35*, as meaning that women should bear no part in public worship is to do violence to the Scriptures which, being inspired, must always and everywhere be harmonious. Thus in *Acts 21:8, 9*, we read that Philip the evangelist "had four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy." Paul speaks of Phebe, "a servant of the church which is at Cenchrea" (*Romans 16:1*), and in *Philippians 4:3* bespeaks the care of the church for "those women which labored with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other fellow-laborers." And the mighty and eloquent Apollos was instructed in the way of God by Aquila and his wife Priscilla. *Acts 18:2, 24-26. SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.21*

In the Old Testament we read of "Miriam the prophetess" (*Exodus 15:20*) by whom the Lord spoke as well as by Moses and Aaron (*Numbers 12:1, 2*). We read also (*Judges 4*) of "Deborah, a prophetess" who judged Israel, and whose wisdom and prudence were esteemed so highly that Barak would not go to war without her counsel and her presence. Still later we read of "Huldah the prophetess" (*2 Kings 22:14*) to whom Josiah sent when he would inquire of the Lord concerning the book of the law which the priest had found. There is something remarkable about this case. At this time Jeremiah had been prophesying for five years, yet the king sent to Huldah instead of to him. Moreover the king's messengers to the prophetess were, among others, a scribe of the law, and the high priest, whose lips should keep knowledge, and at whose mouth men were accustomed to seek the law. *Micah 2:7*. Yet it seems that on this occasion no one had the word of the Lord except this woman. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 278.22*

We have considered this matter at this length not only for the satisfaction of our correspondent, but also to meet a very common infidel cavil. There are many men, and more women, of a class who seek to overthrow the divinely-established order of nature, who are accustomed to rail at the apostle Paul as a crusty old bachelor and a misogynist, because of his words to the Corinthians. Hastily assuming that he absolutely forbade women to take any part in public meetings, they think that the present liberty accorded to women is an evidence of the advance which people of the nineteenth century have made over Paul's antiquated notions. From railing at Paul they naturally come to despise all his writings, and as a natural consequence, they lightly esteem the entire Bible. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 279.1*

But Paul was not crusty, he was not a misogynist, and he was not a bachelor. He was a large-hearted, whole-souled, loving Christian, who treats of the family relation with a knowledge and tenderness not exceeded by any writer who ever lived. Instead of commanding women to say nothing in meetings for the worship of God, he encouraged them even to occupy responsible positions. What he did do was to give instruction that would keep them from being classed with the heathen women who, in their eagerness for notice, divested themselves of that modesty which always characterizes true woman, and which the gospel tends to heighten. *W. SITI May 12, 1887, page 279.2*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

This is the way that prohibition was defeated in Michigan: The *Union Signal* states that one of the northern precincts which has a population of 1,200 men, women, and children, returned 1,800 votes against prohibition. One ward in Detroit returned sixteen prohibition votes, when sixty men stated upon oath that they had deposited prohibition ballots in the box. Such frauds alone would be sufficient to show that the liquor traffic is of the devil. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.1*

The *Independent's* report of the revival meetings in Cleveland says: "Solo singing will cease to be a feature in

these meetings. Perhaps this feature, for a time so popular will be less popular in evangelistic meetings hereafter, and there will be a return to the earlier practice of the time of Finney, Nettleton, Kirke, and Foote. It has been noticeable here that the people have called for familiar congregational hymns. The effect of this congregational singing has been marked. No solo singing could compare with it for moving power." This will be found always to be the case. Solo singing has no rightful place in the worship of God. We love to hear a vocal artist, merely as an artist, but praise is a part of worship that cannot be done by proxy. "Praise Him, all ye people." *SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.2*

On the 28th of April, Elder A. T. Jones, of this office, accompanied by Brother M. J. Church, of Fresno, Cal., left Oakland to attend the annual National Reform Convention which was appointed to be held in Pittsburgh, Penn., May 11 and 12. The convention was first appointed to be held in Chicago, but the managers concluded that the atmosphere of Pittsburg would be more congenial. The readers of the SIGNS will be favored with a report of the proceedings and temper of the convention; but the *American Sentinel*, which Elder Jones specially represents, will contain the fullest reports and also reviews of the subjects discussed. The *Sentinel*, true to its name, intends to closely watch the work of National Reform (false so called), and those who wish to keep informed as to the growth and character of the organization which, under the guise of Christianity, aims to overthrow religious freedom in this country, should take that paper. Send your address and fifty cents to *American Sentinel*, 1059 Castro Street, Oakland, Cal., and receive the paper for one year. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.3*

We often speak of Roman Catholicism in terms of condemnation. We cannot speak of it in any other terms, if we speak of it at all, because the Bible calls it "that Wicked," the "mystery of iniquity," the "man of sin," the "transgression of desolation," and has declared it to be "full of names of blasphemy," "BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." But while this is true, would not for a moment be understood as speaking against individuals who are classed as members of that body. We speak against the system of iniquity, and not against those who are deceived by it. That God recognizes many of his people among the members of the Roman Catholic Church, and churches which are allied to her, is evident from his call, "Come out of her, my people." There are still souls in that body who are honest at heart as Luther was; and no one should despise anyone who, as was Luther, is a zealous devotee, for he may be one of God's people. Indeed, the servant of God is not warranted in despising any man; those who are willfully following error, are deserving of our pity. "For we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, and living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another." *SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.4*

And now comes "a new revelation" which is "vouchsafed to the saints through Joseph Smith the prophet," which settles the question of Sunday observance, for the present, at least. The "revelation" was given at Kirtland, Ohio, April 11, 1887, and the section to which we refer reads as follows:-*SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.5*

"And the Spirit sayeth further: Inasmuch as there has been much discussion in the past concerning the Sabbath of the Lord, the church is admonished that, until further revelation is received, or the quorums of the church are assembled to decide concerning the law in the church articles and covenants, the saints are to observe the first day of the week, commonly called the Lord's day, as a day of rest; as a day of worship, as given in the covenants and commandments. And on this day they should refrain from unnecessary work; nevertheless, nothing should be permitted to go to waste on that day nor should necessary work be neglected. Be not harsh in judgment but merciful in this, as in all other things. Be not hypocrites nor of those who make a man an offender for a word." *SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.6*

Now that is something tangible. We are inclined to the opinion that the Mormons are ahead of their Gentile neighbors who are still searching around in the Bible, for some "dark saying" which by ingenious manipulation may be made to serve as an "inference" that Sunday is the day that should be observed. Positive testimony, even from questionable authority, is so much more convenient than no testimony at all from reliable authority, that first-day observers as a class will doubtless ere long take points from the Mormons. Indeed they have long since taken steps in that direction, in the manufactured testimony from the Fathers. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.7*

The *Christian at Work* says:-*SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.8*

"Holy Thursday was observed by the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of Brooklyn in a union service and a communion celebration in the evening. This shows that harmonious state of feeling among the non-episcopal denominations at least in this vicinity. This, we may add, is not the first service of the kind, as it is pretty sure not to be the last." *SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.9*

"Holy Thursday," indeed! What an expression to be found in a professed Protestant paper! and what a practice for Presbyterians to be engaged in! Whence came its holiness? Oh, "his holiness"-the usurper of

Christ's place as head of the church, the representative of the "man of sin"-has at some time pronounced upon it his benediction, and since the professed Protestants have persistently clung to the Papal Sunday, they are beginning, like consistent persons, to recognize all other Popish festivals. Soon Catholicism and a dead Protestantism that has ceased to protest, will unite on a level (the Catholic level, every time), and then what "a harmonious state of feeling" there will be. No; we are sure that this will not be the last service of the kind. Professed Protestants who *will*, in spite of all reason, persist in observing a counterfeit Sabbath which has no authority but pagan and papal precept and practice, must sooner or later accept all other festivals appointed by the same authority. We rejoice to know that there are yet thousands who will really protest against the abominations of Rome.*SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.10*

The matter of unfermented wine at communion has been much agitated of late in California. We are confident that many oppose the use of unfermented wine at communions, because they either think there can be no such thing, or else they have seen only poor samples of it. For instance, Dr. Thompson, of Berkeley, stated in a recent discussion: Professor Rising of the University has analyzed several specimens of unfermented wine, and has found that they all contained salicylic acid. He told of a young man who had been poisoned nearly to death by using wine in which salicylic acid had been placed as a preservative. He is reported as saying sarcastically that "some churches preferred salicylic acid to alcohol as a preservative agent in their wines, and he was in favor of allowing them to take their choice." For our part we shall choose neither. Notwithstanding the sarcastic insinuation that wine can be preserved only by alcohol or by some acid which is not much to be preferred, we know that good wine contains neither the one nor the other as a preservative agent, but consists solely of unfermented grape juice, without the addition of a particle of anything else. We can verify this statement to any who doubt it. There is no excuse whatever for churches putting temptation in the way of the work, or of mocking Christ by using decomposed grape juice to represent his precious blood.*SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.11*

"Only an Echo" The Signs of the Times, 13, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

At the annual convention of the Baptist Churches of California, recently held in Oakland, there was considerable discussion over the "new theology." "Probation after Death" was the subject of a paper read by Dr. Frost, who styled that unscriptural theory the "great hypothesis," and said: "The great hypothesis was first in vogue among the nations of heathendom, and there is reason to believe that probation after death is the inspiration of the prince of the power of the air, of the power of darkness. It is an echo of that first sermon preached by the serpent in Eden, from the text, 'Thou shalt not surely die.'" *SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.12*

Nobody could have stated the case more forcibly and aptly. All talk of the "larger hope" of a probation after death is simply the devil's device to induce men to slight the gospel and become hardened in sin. It is not a new device, for, as Dr. Frost says, it was popular among the ancient heathen; it has been the strength of Roman Catholicism, but it remained for the present generation to attempt to make it appear to be a part of Protestant Christianity. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.13*

The question that agitates the minds of those who are not willing to see Protestantism wholly paganized is, "How shall we check this growing delusion?" The answer is not difficult, and should be suggested to everyone by the statement which Dr. Frost makes as to its origin. Says he: "It is an echo of that first sermon preached by the serpent in Eden, from the text, 'Thou shalt not surely die.'" Common sense would say, Stop the preaching from that text, and the echo will necessarily cease. There can be no echo without some noise preceding it; when the noise ceases, the echo will cease. And it is a truth that the theory of probation after death is the legitimate result of the doctrine of the indestructibility of the human soul, which doctrine was first preached by Satan, and which is being repeated by thousands of Christian ministers, who are astonished that there should be any echo. Abandon the unscriptural theory that the soul of man cannot die, and probation after death would need no one to combat it. On the other hand, so long as Christian preachers persistently hold that man is by nature immortal, the hypothesis of probation after death will find a hearing. The echo will not die out so long as that which causes it continues. *SITI May 12, 1887, page 286.14*

May 19, 1887

"Words and Thoughts" The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

The psalmist prayed, "Give ear to my words, O Lord; and consider my meditation." *Psalm 5:1*. How few there are who could from the heart make that request? Who would like to have the Lord listen to all that they say? Certainly not they who blaspheme, or who use vulgar, idle, or foolish words, which they would not want even a good man to hear. Yet whether we wish God to hear our words, or not, we may rest assured that he does consider them, for, says the psalmist, "there is not a word in my tongue, but, lo, O Lord, thou knowest it altogether." *Psalm 124:1*. And those words are recorded, for the Saviour says: "But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." *Matthew 12:36, 37. SITI May 19, 1887, page 293.1*

Then there is our meditation. That is worse still, for every heart has cherished thoughts that have never been formed into words, because the individual would not betray his real character to his associates. It is the thoughts which mark the measure and character of the man. "As he thinketh in his heart, so is he." Many people who pass for upright Christians, would be seen to be wholly corrupt, if their thoughts were but laid open to public view. Well, whether we pray that God will consider our meditation or not, we may rest assured that he does do so, "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." *Hebrews 4:12, 13. SITI May 19, 1887, page 293.2*

The heart of mind of man is to the Lord like a printed page. He knows all its imaginings. And the time is coming when not only the Lord, but all the world, will be able to read the secrets of the heart. The apostle says that when the Lord comes he will "bring to light the hidden thing of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart." *1 Corinthians 4:5*. That will be the time when he who now is lifted up shall be terribly abased. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 293.3*

Who is the one, then, who can ask the Lord to consider his meditation, and who will not be put to shame in the Judgment? It is he whose delight is in the law of the Lord, in which he meditates day and night. It is he whose works are committed to the Lord, and whose thoughts are consequently established. It is he who is pure I heart. What a blessed condition does that man occupy, who can rejoice in the thought that the pure and holy God knows all his thoughts and approves them. Our daily prayer should be: "Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer." *Psalm 19:14. W. SITI May 19, 1887, page 293.4*

"He Descended into Hell"

E. J. Waggoner

This is one clause of the so-called apostles' creed, which was formulated somewhere between the fourth and the ninth centuries, and which is now adopted by nearly the whole of Christendom. The sentiment was evidently based on the mistranslation of the Greek word *hades*, in *Acts 2:27*, and a misconception of *1 Peter 3:18-20*. In the last number but one of the SIGNS, we showed what this text really does mean, and now, according to promise, we propose to show what it does not mean; that it cannot by any possibility mean that in the interval between his crucifixion and his resurrection Christ went to some unknown region where wicked spirits were confined, and preached to them. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.1*

It cannot be possible that the thousands who are accustomed to interpret *1 Peter 3:18-20* as we have just indicated, as proof that what we call death is not really death, have any idea of all that such an interpretation involves. A few words, however, will suffice to show any candid, thinking person that those who use this text to prove the immortality of the soul, thereby open the door for the introduction of some grievous heresies. If it were true that the "spirits in prison," of whom Peter speaks, were preached to by Christ in person in the period between his crucifixion and his resurrection, then we should be forced to admit, - *SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.2*

1. That there is a probation after death. For preaching is for the purpose of saving those who will believe. *1 Corinthians 1:21; Romans 10:13, 14*. It makes no difference whether the ones preached to will believe and repent or not; the fact that they are preached to, shows that there is a possibility of their repenting, and therefore they are still on probation. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.3*

2. We should also have to admit the Catholic dogma of purgatory, for that doctrine is based chiefly on this common perversion of this text. Purgatory and probation after death are practically synonymous.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.4*

3. Prayers for the dead would follow as a necessary consequence. For if souls are in a condition to be preached to, they are on probation; and if they are on probation, there is a possibility that they may be saved; and if there is a possibility that they may be saved, all good people ought to, and will, pray that they may be saved. It is not necessary here to show how unscriptural all these positions are, for nearly all Protestants are agreed that they are unscriptural; what we design is to show those who reject purgatory and prayers for the dead, that they cannot do so consistently without also rejecting the dogma of the natural immortality of the soul.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.5*

Another point: The same ones who use *1 Peter 3:18-20* as proving that the man does not wholly die, use Christ's reply to the thief on the cross (*Luke 23:43*) to prove the same thing. From the one they claim that Christ descended into some place where the wicked antediluvians were kept, and preached to them, and from the other they claim that immediately after his death he went to paradise. These two positions destroy each other, for if Christ spent the time between his death and his resurrection in preaching to wicked spirits in purgatory, he certainly did not go to the "paradise of God." Some people seeing the inconsistency of these two positions, both of which are wrong, have sought to evade it by taking another position equally erroneous, namely, that those wicked spirits were in paradise! As many people are in doubt over this point, we shall, ere long, show from the Bible what and where paradise is.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.6*

But does not the Bible say something about Christ being in hell? It does say that he was in a place which King James's translation incorrectly rendered "hell," but which the revisers have very properly left untranslated, namely, *hades*. In *Acts 2:25-31* we read the following:-*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.7*

"For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved; therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope; because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance. Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption."*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.8*

The words which Peter here quoted, "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*," are found in *Psalms 16:10* where the Hebrew word corresponding to *hades* in the New Testament is *sheol*. Let us now examine a few texts to ascertain the nature of this place, who go there, and their condition while there.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.9*

1. Good people go there. This is proved by the fact that Christ went there. Jacob said to his sons who thought to comfort him after Joseph was taken away, "I will go down into the grave [*sheol*] unto my son mourning." *Genesis 37:35*. He expected to go to *sheol*, and he knew that Joseph, if dead, was there. When Christ comes and calls the righteous from their graves, and the saying is brought to pass that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory," they will shout, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave [*hades*], where is thy victory?" *1 Corinthians 15:51-55*.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.10*

2. Wicked people also go there. David says of the wicked: "Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward. Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me; then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression. Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer." *Psalms 19:11-14*. We read also of the rebellious princes of Israel, that "the ground clave asunder that was under them; and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods. They, and all that appertained to them, went down alive into the pit, and the earth closed upon them; and they perished from among the congregation." *Numbers 16:31-33*.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.11*

3. All must go to this place. Says David: "What man is he that liveth, and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave [*sheol*]?" *Psalms 89:48*.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.12*

4. The souls as well as the bodies of men and likewise animals, go there. See *Numbers 16:31-33*; *Psalms 49:15*; *89:48*; *Acts 2:31*, etc.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.13*

5. The wicked who go there are silent. Says David: "Let the wicked be ashamed, and let them be silent in the grave [*sheol*]." *Psalms 31:17*.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.14*

6. The righteous who go there do not call on the Lord. "For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave [sheol] who shall give thee thanks?" "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." *Psalm 115:17.SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.15*

7. Not only do the righteous not praise the Lord in *sheol* but no one who goes there can be converted to the truth. Said Hezekiah: "For the grave [sheol] cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." *Isaiah 38:18.SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.16*

8. It is a land of forgetfulness. "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? Selah. Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" *Psalm 88:10-12.SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.17*

9. Finally, it is a place where there is absolutely no consciousness of anything. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave [sheol], whither thou goest." *Ecclesiastes 9:10.SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.18*

10. Dead people cannot think. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." *Psalm 118:3, 4. See also John 11:21; Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6, etc.SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.19*

These texts show conclusively that it is absolutely impossible that at the time of Christ's crucifixion there could have been any of the antediluvian sinners, or any others who had died, capable of listening to preaching, or that Christ could have preached to them or to anybody else, between his crucifixion and his resurrection. In addition to these texts, we may note that Christ's soul was in *hades*, whence it was rescued only by his resurrection (*Acts 2:31*); that it was Christ's soul that was made an offering for sin (*Isaiah 53:10*); and that his soul was poured out unto death (*Isaiah 53:12*). Surely lovers of the Bible ought to accept the simple, consistent statements of that book, rather than a view which makes the Bible contradict itself, and brings in a train of pernicious heresies. W.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.20*

"The Lord's Prayer. Lead Us Not into Temptation" The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

This petition cannot well be considered apart from that which immediately follows it: "but deliver us from evil." Both together form a fitting climax to this wonderful prayer, for they indicate, if used understandingly, the soul's desire for purity of heart.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.21*

There are two senses in which the word tempted is used in the Bible. The apostle says: "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations." *James 1:2*. Again he says: "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed." *Verse 14*. Now it is evident that the apostle would not exhort men to count it a joyful thing to be drawn away of their own lust, and enticed into sin; therefore the temptation of the second verse is different from that of the fourteenth.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.22*

The temptation of the second verse is that which is successfully met, and which leaves the individual stronger than ever. It is the trying of faith. In *Ephesians 6:16* we learn that faith is the shield by which the darts of the wicked may be quenched. The office of a shield is to protect the person. If a missile is received upon the shield, the person at whom it was aimed receives no injury; he does not feel it. The temptations, then, which work patience, and which strengthen, are those which meet with no response in our own hearts, but which are instantly repelled.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.23*

The other temptations are those which are entertained in the heart. The sin presents itself, and the mind goes out towards it, and longs for it. It may be that the overt act is never committed, but since "the thought of foolishness is sin" (*Proverbs 24:9*), the one who only in imagination does the sinful act is in the sight of God accounted guilty. Such temptations as those are natural to every human being, "for from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts."*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.24*

The petition "*lead us not into temptation*," must be understood as meaning, "suffer us not to fall into temptation;" and it must also be understood as referring to the second class of temptations, those which proceed from within. The reason is (1) that we are not to ask freedom from trials, but rather to count them a blessing, and (2) that God cannot and does not lead people into sin. The prayer, then, is "suffer us not to fall into foolish and hurtful lust, but deliver us (keep us back) from evil."*SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.25*

This cannot mean that God will not allow a man to act out the evil that is in him, for that would be impossible; if evil is in the heart, it must show itself, and we are expressly told that at one time God left a man to do what his heart prompted him to do. The man was Hezekiah. After he had been healed, the Babylonian

ambassadors came to congratulate, and he showed them all the treasures of his kingdom. *2 Kings 20:12, 13*. This action was prompted by pride. *2 Chronicles 32:24, 25*. The historian, speaking of this, says: "Howbeit in the business of the ambassadors of the princes of Babylon, who sent unto him to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land, God left him, to try him, that he might know all that was in his heart." *2 Chronicles 32:31*. We must therefore conclude that the petition "lead us not into temptation" does not mean that God is to interpose his mighty power to miraculously preserve us from the wickedness that is in our own hearts. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 294.26*

There can be, then, but one conclusion, and that is that the prayer implies a renunciation and hatred of sin, and a desire to have the heart cleansed from it, and to be strengthened again allowing it to pass the shield of faith, and gain access to the heart. This is the only way that temptations can be instantly repelled, since, as we have read, evil thoughts are natural to the human heart. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.1*

It was to effect this that Christ came into the earth. It is not enough that we be freed from the guilt of sin, -from past transgressions, -but we must be freed from the love of sin. Paul says that Christ "gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father." *Galatians 1:1*. This "present evil world" does not mean the physical creation, but "all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life." *1 John 2:16*. Again we read that he "gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." *Titus 2:14*. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.2*

This is what God wants to do for us; it is what we are to ask him to do for us, for he will not do it against our will. What is there to hinder his doing it? Nothing, if we offer the prayer in all sincerity, "lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." We cannot cleanse ourselves from the defilement of sin, however much we may desire to be freed from it (*Proverbs 20:9*); but if we do earnestly desire to be kept from sin, God will work in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure (*Philippians 2:13*), and that will be to make us perfect in every good work to do his will, working in us that which is good. *Hebrews 13:21*. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.3*

But while this is in one sense a passive state, in that it is an entire yielding of self to God, it is by no means a state of inactivity. "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." *James 4:7*. "Strive to enter in at the strait gate." *Luke 13:24*. There is to be a constant watchfulness against the insidious assaults of the enemy. A reaching out after God implies a drawing away from sin. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.4*

This part of the Lord's prayer cannot be uttered from the heart, except of him who with the psalmist can say, "I hate vain thoughts, but thy law do I love." And this cannot be done until the individual realizes that fellowship with God is the only thing to be desired, -that the loving-kindness of God is better than life. Every man in the world will have just what he wants. If he loves the pleasures of sin, he will be left to its lusting enjoyment; but if his heart and his soul cry out after God, the promise is that he shall be filled. *W.SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.5*

"Liquor and the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

A case that recently occurred in New York, in connection with the enforcement of the Sunday law, is somewhat significant. Some liquor sellers were brought before the court, when their counsel contended that they had not violated the law, because it forbids selling liquor on *the Sabbath*, and that Sabbath means the seventh day of the week, while they had sold it on the first day. This puzzled the Judge, until he consulted Webster's Dictionary, where he learned that "the Sabbath of Christians is on Sunday." Accordingly the men were convicted. We have no sympathy with saloon men, but we note this as showing that in the enforcement of Sunday laws, custom, and not reason is the guide. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.6*

"Conditional Immortality—What Is It?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

At the Baptist Convention recently held in this city, one of the essays, written and read by a prominent clergyman, contained the following: -*SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.7*

"Two of the foremost nations of the world stand face to face with two great problems. Conditional immortality is leavening the Church of England, and probation after death is sapping the foundation of Congregationalism." *SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.8*

From the fact that the essayist connected conditional immortality with probation after death, which he regards

as a dangerous heresy, we conclude that he regards conditional immortality in the same light. We know, indeed, that many people do regard that doctrine as a pernicious one, and we are forced to conclude that, if they are honest, their aversion is due to ignorance of what conditional immortality is.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.9*

What is meant by conditional immortality? Simply this, that immortality, or eternal life, which is the same thing, is conditioned upon the individual's belief in Christ. It means that "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." *Romans 6:23*. It is the doctrine which our Saviour himself taught, when he said: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." *John 3:36*. Or as expressed by the apostle: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." *1 John 5:11*.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.10*

It is the doctrine which Christ taught to Nicodemus in these words: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." *John 3:16*. It is the doctrine which gives Christ his rightful title of Life-giver, which he himself claimed, when he said: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." *John 10:10*.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.11*

To hear the same men talk, one would get the idea that the doctrine of conditional immortality is rank infidelity, and utterly opposed to all true Christianity. As a matter of fact, it is based on the reception of the fact that in all things Christ has the preeminence; that man can have nothing except as he gets it through Christ.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.12*

As a matter of fact, a denial of the doctrine of conditional immortality is to that extent a denial of Christ. Indeed, we may truly say that it is wholly a denial of Christ, since it denies the very thing for which Christ came. He himself declares that his only object, by believing on him, have life. Now the man who says that eternal life is not conditioned upon his believing in Christ, virtually says that man has no need of Christ. This was just what so many of the ancient Jews did, to whom Christ sadly said, "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." They did not profess to be Christians; they rejected Christ unreservedly. Is it not strange that in these days Christ is rejected in exactly the same way by those who profess to love and honor him? Why should people refuse to acknowledge their indebtedness to Christ for all that they have or hope to have? *W. SITI May 19, 1887, page 295.13*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

Last Sunday evening (May 15) a series of meetings was begun in a 60-foot tent on the corner of 8th and Myrtle Street, Oakland, with a good attendance. These meetings will continue several weeks during the entire week, and will be devoted to the consideration of the prophecies for this time, and practical Bible truth in general. Preaching will begin every evening and 7:45, except Sunday evenings, when the service will begin at 7:30. Services will be conducted by Elders J. O. Corliss and R. S. Owen.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.1*

The international convention of the Young Men's Christian Association was held in San Francisco last week. Delegates were present from every state and territory in the union, and from some foreign countries. This week there is a Secretaries' Conference in Oakland. California is no longer regarded as outside the world, and societies and associations of all classes are holding general meetings here. We are glad to know that the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists is going to fall into line and meet here next fall.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.2*

The *Christian Cyneour* says that it is "sorry to see in the *United Presbyterian* a strong apology for Good Friday and Easter, on the ground that the doctrine and fact of the resurrection deserve a prominent place in pulpit instruction, and if a certain time for this is not set apart by the authority of some pope, our pious and godly pastors will forget it." And in this connection the same paper indorses certain views of Dr. Howard Crosby, and says that he "reasons strongly and truly upon this Easter matter, showing that the popular celebration has no foundation in Scripture, and therefore should not be observed." Yet the *Cycamore* calls Sunday "the Sabbath" and "Lord's day," strangely losing sight of the fact that this festival stands upon precisely the same ground as Easter and Good Friday. The latter have just as much foundation in the Scriptures as the former, and they are vastly less potent for evil, for the reason that they do not displace a divinely ordained day, or render necessary the violation of the law of God, as does Sunday-keeping.*SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.3*

The *Christian Register* (Unitarian) has published a series of letters from prominent scientific men, in answer to questions as to whether or not the immortality of the soul is proved to any degree by science. The *Christian Union* says of these answers: "A considerable divergence of opinions is exhibited. On the whole, however, the letters are not encouraging reading to a Christian believer. The weight of authority, we should say, appears to

be in support of the doctrine that the question lies wholly without the pale of science, properly so-called, though we judge that those who give this answer mean by science simply natural science. One or two of the writers take the position that the doctrine of immortality rests wholly on revelation." *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.4*

And this is said to be discouraging reading for Christians. We can't see how it can concern Christians in the least. Christ brings "life and immortality to light through the gospel," and he is our life. The fact that science confesses itself ignorant of a future life, should not be at all discouraging to the Christian. The true Christian will not seek to "demonstrate" the immortality of the soul. They who claim inherent immortality for men, seek to rob Christ of his divine prerogative of Lifegiver. It certainly should cause no sorrow to a Christian to know that immortality is unknown outside of Christ. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.5*

The only day of the week which is named in the Bible is the seventh day. That is called the Sabbath. All other days of the week are invariably referred to by their number, but the last day of the week is most commonly known by its title, Sabbath. Since the time when the Bible was written, names have been given to all the days of the week. The first day is called Sunday, the second, Monday, the third, Tuesday, etc. A secular title, Saturday, has also been given to the seventh day, but its only true name is Sabbath. Knowing this, we can see the absurdity of the note in Webster's dictionary, which says that "the Sabbath of the Christians is on Sunday." But there is only one Sabbath, and how can that come on Sunday? It would be just as reasonable to say that the Monday of the Chinese comes on Wednesday, or that the Sunday of the Mohammedans comes on Friday. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.6*

The Psalmist prayed: "The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble; Grant thee according to thine own heart, and fulfil all thy counsel." *Psalm 20:1, 4*. That is a comprehensive request, and it would seem that it could not be granted; at any rate there are very few people who have all they want. Yet in the very next psalm we read, "Thou hast given him his heart's desire, and hast not withholden the request of his lips." *Psalm 21:2*. There was one, at least, who had everything he wished for, and we are assured that anyone may fare as well. The psalmist again says: "Delight thyself also in the Lord, and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart." *Psalm 37:4*. The condition is, delight thyself in the Lord. now we can understand it. He who delights himself in the Lord, will not delight himself in things which are contrary to the Lord and his righteousness, and if he does not delight in them he will not want them. If he delights in the Lord, he will desire only that which will tend to make his union with the Lord still closer, and the promise is that they who hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be filled. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.7*

The *Independent* says of the Sabbath-day during which Jesus lay in the tomb: "It was a day not to be recorded; a day to block out of the calendar of history. So none of the evangelists tell us anything of that ever-to-be-forgotten day." It must be that the editor of that paper has seldom, and possibly never, read *Luke 23:55, 56*: "And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day according to the commandment." This is all that is recorded of that day, but it is enough; it is all there was to record. The disciples did not do any thing, they simply rested, and it takes but few words to state that simple fact. All the record we have of the first seventh day of time is that God rested upon it; we are told to remember every seventh day, to keep it holy; and we are also told that these humble disciples kept that one Sabbath "according to the commandment." What a shout would go up if only one recorded instance of a rest upon the first day, could be found in the Bible. *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.8*

"A Significant Paragraph" The Signs of the Times, 13, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

The "narrative" read at a recent session of the Presbytery of Oregon, contains the following significant paragraph:- *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.9*

"From almost every part of the presbytery comes a bitter lamentation over the excessive worldliness which surrounds and which in too many cases exists in the church. No particular form of evil is spoken of—but simply a general encroachment of the world upon the church, or a kind of indifference upon the subject of religion." *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.10*

This is significant, because we know from the Bible that it is characteristic of the last days. "Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold," said the Saviour, and on every hand we see his words fulfilled to-day. Thousands everywhere are in the condition described by the apostle, "having a form of godliness but denying the power thereof;" and while it is probably true that no one form of evil is particularly prevalent, "the general encroachment of the world upon the church," and "indifference upon the subject of religion," indicate that we are in that time when iniquity abounds; but the Saviour added, "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved;" and we should comfort our hearts with this thought and be assured that "the coming of

the Lord draweth nigh." *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.11*

"Antichrist" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

From an editorial in the last number of the *Catholic Mirror*, we take the following extracts reflecting the idolatry which the Papal Church imposes upon those who blindly accept its teachings:-*SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.12*

"Devotion to the blessed virgin is the best indication of the faith and sincerity that dwell in the Catholic heart." "Her office is that of protectoress of the weak and faltering, and the dispenser of mercies and graces, flowing from the fountain of all good." "It is inconceivable that a Catholic who understands the position of Mary,-the attitude of powerful mediatrix in which she lovingly stands between him, in his ever-recurring lapses from the narrow path, and the justice of God,-should fail to be drawn towards her by the strongest and deepest feelings of reverence and devotion." *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.13*

"Devotion to the blessed virgin, we are told by some of the greatest saints who illustrated the truth of this belief in their own lives, is the surest passport to eternal exaltation." *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.14*

The Bible student will readily see that Christ is left altogether out of the account in this *dictum*, which denies such statements as that the name of Jesus is the only one under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved (*Acts 4:12*); and that "God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things in earth and things under the earth." *Philippians 2:9, 10*. And yet there are thousands of professed Protestants who are almost ready to stone anyone who says that the Papacy is antichrist! *SITI May 19, 1887, page 304.15*

May 26, 1887

"What and Where Is Paradise?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

"And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." *Luke 23:42, 43*. This language will be recognized at once as the request of the penitent thief who was crucified with Jesus, and the reply of our Lord. It has been the subject of an unlimited amount of controversy, and doubtless will be, as long as men choose to interpret the Bible according to their system of theology, instead of deriving their system of theology wholly from the Bible. We do not design at this time to give a detailed exposition of the text, but simply to note a few points concerning paradise. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.1*

From Christ's language to Mary, recorded in *John 20:17*, three days after the crucifixion, it is very evident that he did not go to Heaven on the day when he gave the thief the solemn assurance that they should meet in paradise. On account of this text, many who cling tenaciously to the idea that Jesus did not actually die, argue that Christ did go to paradise that day, but that paradise is not in Heaven. Then they connect this text with their erroneous reading of *1 Peter 3:18-20*, and conclude that paradise is a sort of half-way house-an intermediate place between earth and heaven-where all souls, both good and bad, are retained until the Judgment. In short, paradise is made identical with hades. A very few texts will suffice to show that this is a most erroneous conclusion. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.2*

First, however, we wish to call attention to the fact that if this definition of paradise were true, the Saviour's promise to the thief would be made nonsense. If paradise were only a place where souls remain between death and the final judgment, then Christ's promise to the penitent thief would amount simply to this: To-day shalt thou be with me in the place of the dead! There would certainly be nothing very comforting about that, and nothing that would require the exercise of much faith, seeing both Jesus and the thief were at that time hanging on the cross; but this is what Christ's answer meant, if the theory be true that paradise and hades are identical. This fact alone should be sufficient to show the fallacy of such a view. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.3*

There are only three places in the Bible where the word "paradise" is used. One is in the text quoted at the beginning of this article. The second is in *2 Corinthians 12:2-4*, which we quote:-*SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.4*

"I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth;) how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.5*

This text proves conclusively that paradise is not an intermediate place between earth and Heaven, but that it is Heaven itself. In the first place, Paul says that he (for he speaks of himself) was caught up into the third Heaven, and then in repeating the statement for emphasis, he says that he was caught up into paradise. Then Christ's promise to the thief on the cross involved nothing less than that the thief should be with him in the third Heaven. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.6*

In *Revelation 2:7* we find the following promise, given by the Spirit:-*SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.7*

"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.8*

From this text we learn that paradise contains the tree of life. Turn now to *Revelation 22:1, 2*, and read: "And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life." Here we learn that the tree of life is in the midst of the New Jerusalem, which contains the throne of God. But the tree of life is in the midst of the paradise of God (*Revelation 2:7*); therefore we must conclude that the paradise of God is in the midst of the city of God, and that whoever goes to paradise goes into the immediate presence of God. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.9*

"Paradise" is an Anglicized Greek word meaning a park or a beautiful garden. Earthly cities have parks and pleasure gardens, and the heavenly Jerusalem has one also, but as much more beautiful than earthly gardens as the city whose builder and maker is God, is grander than cities built by man. Now compare this with *Ezekiel 28:13*: "Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, the emerald, and the carbuncle, and gold." Read with this the description of the New Jerusalem, in the twenty-first of Revelation,

and it will be seen at once that the Garden of Eden and paradise are the same.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.10*

When Adam sinned, he was driven from the Garden of Eden; nothing sinful could be allowed to remain there. So we read of the New Jerusalem which contains the paradise of God, that "there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." *Revelation 21:27*. This, together with *Revelation 2:7* and *22:14*, teaches us that entrance into paradise, and enjoyment of its delights, is to be the reward of those who shall overcome through faith in Christ. But the righteous are rewarded only at the coming of the Lord in his kingdom and the resurrection of the just (*Matthew 16:27; 25:31; Luke 14:14*); and that was just what the thief asked for in the words, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." *W.SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.11*

"One Probation Enough" The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

"Let favour be showed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness; in the land of uprightness will he deal unjustly, and will not behold the majesty of the Lord." *Isaiah 26:10*. This text is of itself sufficient to show the folly of the claims that after death there will be another probation for those who have not accepted Christ in this life. Of course the text does not mean that the grace of God is entirely in vain, and that no wicked persons will turn from their wicked ways, for Paul says that the grace of God does bring salvation (*Titus 2:11*); and if it were not for the grace of God, as manifested in the gift of his Son, it would be impossible for anybody to repent. But it does mean that those who will not repent in consequence of the ordinary manifestations of God's favor, would only be hardened still more by greater manifestations of it.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.12*

The case of Pharaoh is right to the point. In the first place he had the same call that is extended to all the world: "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." This call is to all the world, and included Pharaoh. It cannot be said that he had no chance, for the chosen people of God were right in his own land.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.13*

Then Moses came to him with a message direct from the Lord, saying "Let my people go." And in order that he might know from whom the message came, miracles were wrought, showing the power of God. Here he had additional opportunity to acknowledge God, but he refused.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.14*

Then God's judgments began to come, and when the agents of Satan, the magicians, could no longer counterfeit these wonders, the proud king was constrained to beg for the favor of God, whom he had despised. His request was granted, and the frogs were removed: "But when Pharaoh saw that there was respite, he hardened his heart, and hearkened not unto them." *Exodus 8:15.SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.15*

Again the power of God was manifested in judgments, and again the king sent for the servants of the Lord, and begged that the plague of flies might be removed. "And Moses went out from Pharaoh, and entreated the Lord. And the Lord did according to the word of Moses; and he removed the swarms of flies from Pharaoh, from his servants, and from his people; there remained not one. And Pharaoh hardened his heart at this time also, neither would he let the people go." *Exodus 8:30-32.SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.16*

Still closer and closer came the judgments, so that it was absolutely impossible for anyone to doubt the power and majesty of God. The cattle were destroyed, terrible boils broke out upon man and beast, and finally a fearful storm of thunder, hail, and fire, was sent, which destroyed everything in its path. "And Pharaoh sent, and called for Moses and Aaron, and said unto them, I have sinned this time; the Lord is righteous, and I and my people are wicked. Entreat the Lord (for it is enough) that there be no more mighty thunderings and hail; and I will let you go, and ye shall stay no longer." *Exodus 9:27, 28*. "And Moses went out of the city from Pharaoh, and spread abroad his hands unto the Lord: and the thunders and hail ceased, and the rain was not poured upon the earth. And when Pharaoh saw that the rain and the hail and the thunders were ceased, he sinned yet more, and hardened his heart, he and his servants. And the heart of Pharaoh was hardened, neither would he let the children of Israel go; as the Lord had spoken by Moses." *Verses 33-35.SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.17*

Here we have a perfect illustration of the truth spoken by the prophet Isaiah: "Let favor be showed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness." The more favor was showed to Pharaoh, the more hardened he became. It was not until a plague was sent from which there could be no respite, that he relented long enough to let the people go as the Lord had commanded; and even then, when there seemed to be a prospect of no more judgments, he hardened his heart and rushed forth to his own destruction.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.18*

Thus it would be with the wicked if God should grant them a second probation. In this life they have had a chance to see the power of God manifested in both mercy and judgment. Sometimes they have trembled at the near approach of danger, but have hardened their hearts as soon as the danger was past. By and by the Lord will be "revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire." *2 Thessalonians 1:7, 8*. "A fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." *Psalms 50:3*. Then "the lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day." *Isaiah 2:11*. Everyone will then be willing to confess "that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.19*

Now what would be the result if after all this God should grant the wicked another probation? Both revelation and experience show that they would be worse than they ever were before. To give them another probation, would be worse than casting pearls before swine. The reason for this is, that God never cuts off any sinner while his heart is tender, and when his heart has ceased to be tender, nothing but terrible judgments can make any impression upon him, and the only impression they can make is that of cowardly fear. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.20*

It is true that many of the advocates of a second probation claim that it will be granted only to those who in this life have "not had a fair chance." That this is a direct charge against the justice of God, will be shown at another time; it is sufficient here to remind the reader that a "second probation" necessarily implies a first, and a probation is a trying, a testing. Therefore to say that any will have a second probation, is to admit that they have been tried once and found wanting. In other words, they have "had a fair chance," and having refused it, they would count any additional favor an evidence of weakness on the part of God, and would deride him for it. *W. SITI May 26, 1887, page 310.21*

"The Days of Creation" The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

In the notes on the current International Sunday-school Lesson, we find the following comment on the expression, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth," etc.:—*SITI May 26, 1887, page 311.1*

"Not in six periods of twenty-four hours; for during the first three, when the sun was not made, there were no such twenty-four-hour days. But divine days (doubtless long periods), beginning from the darkness, and going on with the dawn, or beginning, and to their full maturity." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 311.2*

The writer thinks that the only reason why the days of creation were not twenty-four-hour days was because (as he says) the sun was not created till after the third was passed. That would imply that after the sun was created the days might be literal days. But if the remaining days were literal days, the first then must have been literal also. Now it is a matter of fact that the sun was made to rule the day; and it would be doing gross violence to the language to say that the word day in *Genesis 1:16* means anything different from what it does in every other place where it occurs in the same chapter. But the sun does not rule an indefinite period of time, but simply a twenty-four-hour day. Hence, the days of creation were literal days such as we are familiar with, of which it takes seven to make a week. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 311.3*

Moreover, the first three days were days of twenty-four hours, just the same as the last four, and every day since. The day is not made by the sun but by the revolution of the earth on its axis, and the earth could revolve if the sun and moon, it did not shine, the language indicates that this was the case. There was "the first day," "the second day," and "the third day." Each of these days was composed of a period of darkness succeeded by a period of light, but the sun did not shine. And the sun and moon were made to be light-bearers, to rule the day and night. The sun was made to rule the day. What day? The day which was already formed by the revolution of the earth on its axis, and which could henceforth be more distinctly marked than before. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 311.4*

It is a mistaken idea that the sun was not created till the fourth day. In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. The sun and moon were created "in the beginning," on the first day, but were not made to be light-bearers until the fourth day. And probably they were not made to assume their present shape until that time. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 311.5*

There is not a single argument that can be deduced to show that the days of creation were not literal days. The obvious meaning of the text requires that they should be so considered. It is a forced an awkward assumption which makes them long periods,—an assumption which was devised by certain devotees of "science falsely so-called," in order to avoid excepting the simple truth of the Bible, and which is followed by certain professors of religion, and in order to avoid keeping the Sabbath of the Lord. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 311.6*

"Within Thy Gates" The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

The fourth commandment says of the Sabbath, "in it thou shalt not do any work.... nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." On this expression, Peloubet's "Select Notes on the International Lessons" says:*SITI May 26, 1887, page 311.7*

"Those who come to live in your village or city. Gates are those of the town, not the doors of the house or yard. If heathen come to live in your cities, they must conform to the Sabbath laws; if strangers can do business on the Sabbath, they will soon lead others to do it."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 311.8*

This is a new interpretation of the commandment, and shows the influence of "National Reform" teachings. The only fault to be found with it is that it makes nonsense of the commandment, and is untrue. 1. The commandment is addressed to the heathen just as much as it is to anybody. They are under just as much obligation to keep the Sabbath in their own land as they are when in a so-called Christian land. 2. The commandment is addressed to individuals, not to committees or towns. Note the language: "In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter," etc. This is addressed to the individual, not to the town; for the town does not have any son nor daughter. Then since the "thy" before son and daughter necessarily refers to an individual, and not to a collection of individuals, it follows that the "thy" before "gates" has reference to a single individual, for there is no change in the subject. Therefore, "the stranger that is within thy gates," means the stranger that is within the gates of any man's house or yard. 3. This language also applies to the heathen in his own land. He is not only commanded to keep the Sabbath, but to see that the Sabbath is not violated by the stranger who visits him. If he fails to do this, he is guilty. The Sabbath law is as binding in a heathen land as in any other.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 311.9*

By no legitimate interpretation can the commandments be made to have more than an individual application. It is not necessary that they should be applied to nations, as such, for if they are observed by all individuals, they will be observed by nations, and if any individuals do not observe them, they are accountable to God alone for their sin.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 311.10*

"Great Words" The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

The prophet Daniel, describing the little horn that came up among the ten horns of the great and terrible beast which symbolizes the Roman power, said: "And, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things." *Daniel 7:8*. These "great words" were said by the angel who interpreted the vision, to be "great words against the Most High." *Verse 25*. The prophet John, in describing the same power under the symbol of a beast like a leopard, says: "And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies." *Revelation 13:5*.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.1*

In no other thing have commentators been so fully agreed as they have in applying these words to the Roman Catholic Church, with the Pope at its head. As the actual fulfillment of a prophecy is the best proof of whether or not any given interpretation is correct, we quote a few of the titles and appellations which have been given to the Pope at various times by his zealous followers, and which the so-called "Holy Father" has received with complacency as rightly belonging to him. The list from which we quote, contains sixty-two different titles; it was collected by S. Francis de Sales, and may be found in Monsignor Capel's book entitled, "The Pope: The Vicar of Christ; the Head of the Church."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.2*

"Most Divine of all Heads."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.3*

"Holy Father of Fathers, Pontiff Supreme over all Prelates."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.4*

"Overseer of the Christian Religion."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.5*

"The Chief Pastor; Pastor of Pastors."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.6*

"Christ by Unction." (That is, the Anointed Christ.)*SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.7*

"Abraham by Patriarchate."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.8*

"Melchisedec in Order."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.9*

"Moses in Authority."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.10*

"Samuel in the Judicial Office." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.11*

"High Priest, Supreme Bishop." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.12*

"Prince of Bishops." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.13*

"Heir of the Apostles; Peter in Power." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.14*

"Key-Bearer of the Kingdom of Heaven." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.15*

"Pontiff Appointed with Plenitude of Power." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.16*

"Vicar of Christ." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.17*

"Sovereign Bishop of Bishops." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.18*

"Sovereign Priest." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.19*

"Ruler of the House of the Lord." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.20*

"Apostolic Lord, and Father of Fathers." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.21*

"Chief Pastor and Teacher and Physician of Souls." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.22*

"Rock, against which the proud gates of Hell prevail not." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.23*

"Infallible Pope." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.24*

"Head of all the Holy Priests of God." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.25*

"Head of all the Holy Churches." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.26*

"Chief of the Universal Church." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.27*

"Bishops of Bishops, that is, Sovereign Pontiff." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.28*

In addition to the list of which the above is only a part, Mgr. Capel gives the following quotations from a letter which "the great S. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux," wrote to Pope Engenius III., A.D. 1150: *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.29*

"Who art thou? The High Priest, the Supreme Bishop. Thou art the Prince of Bishops, thou art the Heir of the Apostles. Thou art Abel in primacy, Noah in government, Abraham in the patriarchal rank, in order Melchisedec, in dignity Aaron, in authority Moses, Samuel in the judicial office, Peter in power, Christ in unction. Thou art he to whom the keys of Heaven are given, to whom the sheep are intrusted. There are, indeed, other doorkeepers of Heaven, and other shepherds of the flocks; but thou art the more glorious in proportion as thou hast also, in a different fashion, inherited before others both these names. The former have the flocks assigned to them each one his own; to thee all are intrusted, One Flock for the One. Not merely for the sheep, but for all the shepherds also thou art the One Shepherd. Whence do I prove this, thou askest? *From the word of the Lord.* For to whom-I say not among the Bishops, but among the Apostles-have the whole flock been committed in a manner so absolute and undistinguishing? 'If thou lovest Mr. Peter, feed my Sheep? What sheep? The inhabitants of this or that city or country, those of a particular kingdom? 'My sheep,' He saith. Who does not see that He designates not some, but all? Nothing is excepted where nothing is distinguished. The power of others is limited by definite bounds; thine extends even over those who have received authority over others. Canst thou not, when a just reason occurs, shut up Heaven against a Bishop, oppose him from his Episcopal office, and deliver him over to Satan? Thus thy privilege is immutable, as well in the keys committed to thee as in the sheep instructed to thy care." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 312.30*

It would seem as though men had exerted all their ingenuity to invent flattering titles for the Pope. This thing itself would be sufficient to condemn the whole system. Elihu said: "Neither let me give flattering titles unto man. For I know not to give flattering titles; in so doing my Maker would soon take me away." *Job 32:21, 22.* And we have no reason to suppose that the giving and receiving of flattering titles is not displeasing to God, for our Saviour himself said: "How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" *John 5:44.* The giving and receiving of flattering titles is an evidence of departure from God, for the honor that comes from God only is given only to the humble. *1 Peter 5:5.* In this case, however, the titles are not simply flattering, but are blasphemous, and show the one to whom they are applied, to be the "man of sin," "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." *W.SITI May 26,*

"Ten Commandments" The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.

(June 12.-Exodus 20:1-11.)

The lesson for this week covers the first four commandments. Our notes must be merely suggestive, as each one of the commandments furnishes ample material for an entire lesson. Before entering upon the lesson proper, the student should read carefully the *19th chapter of Exodus*, where we have an account of the circumstances attending the giving of the law. These were of the utmost grandeur and impressiveness. The Lord came down upon Sinai amid fire and smoke (*Exodus 19:18; Deuteronomy 4:11, 12*), accompanied by his angels (*Deuteronomy 33:2; Psalm 68:17*), and not only the mountain but the earth shook when God spoke. *Exodus 19:18; Psalm 68:7, 8; Hebrews 12:25, 26*. The circumstances attending the giving of the law were calculated to impress the people with a sense of the power and majesty of God, and, consequently, of the sacredness of his law. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 314.1*

THE INTRODUCTION

"And God spake all these words, saying, I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." *Exodus 20:1, 2*. Here God identifies himself. He is the God that brought them forth from bondage. In giving his law, he makes himself known as their Redeemer. When he sent Moses to call them from bondage, he made himself known to them as "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (*Exodus 3:15, 16*); and he also declared his name to be, "I AM THAT I AM." *Exodus 3:14*. This was a declaration that he is the living God, the self-existent One, the Creator of all things. So when from the mount God made himself known to the assembled multitude as the one who had brought them out of Egypt, it would recall the fact that he is the self-existent Creator, who has a right to make and enforce laws. It would also recall his power as manifested in their behalf. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 314.2*

THE FIRST COMMANDMENT

"Thou shalt have no other gods before me." *Exodus 20:3*. This was placed at the head because it is the foundation of everything. We may say that all the rest of the law is summed up in this first commandment. For having no other gods before the true God, means sincere heart worship of him, and perfect worship of God means obedience to all his requirements. The first four commandments embody our duty to God, and the last six our duty to man. But the last six are secondary to the first four, since love to God is first. Love to God necessarily presupposes love to man; "for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" *1 John 4:20. SITI May 26, 1887, page 314.3*

Paul says that "there be gods many and lords many." *1 Corinthians 8:5*. A god is an object of worship. Worship is reverence; one worships whatever his thoughts center upon. As everyone must think, and must have some object toward which his thoughts and efforts are directed, so everyone must have some god. If it is not the living God, it is some god in his stead. Some trust in riches (*1 Timothy 6:17*); such make money their god. See *Job 31:24-28*. In *Colossians 3:5*, also *Ephesians 5:5*, covetousness is declared to be idolatry. The covetous man's mind is absorbed in the contemplation of some earthly object, which shuts out thoughts of God. It is not the rich alone who become idolaters by trusting in uncertain riches instead of the living God, for a poor man may make gold his hope, and long for it to the exclusion of every other object of thought, and thus he is an idolater. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 314.4*

Others worship appetite and the baser passions. Paul speaks of some "whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things." *Philippians 3:19*. There are thousands in so-called Christian lands whose principal thought is, What shall we eat? or what shall we drink? Thousands have let liquor deprive them of their hope of eternal life. Thousands who use the filthy weed tobacco, when they learn that God requires purity of flesh as well as of spirit (*2 Corinthians 7:1*), have said, "Well, I can't give up my tobacco." Thus they have made a god of a pipe, or a plug of tobacco. Is not such idolatry fully as debasing as the crocodile worship of the Egyptians? But we have not space to pursue this subject further. Suffice it to say that the first commandment forbids anything that is not done to the glory of God. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 314.5*

SECOND COMMANDMENT

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." *Exodus 20:4-6.SITI May 26, 1887, page 314.6*

This commandment does not, as many suppose, forbid the simple making of pictures or statuary. It does not forbid the use of postage-stamps or coins having the mark of some Government. No mechanical art could be carried on without making something that is like something else, and the commandment does not forbid this. What the commandment does forbid is the making of any image for the object of worship. The Catholic Church has omitted the second commandment from the list, claiming that it is the same as the first. But this is an error and is done simply that they may seem to have Bible authority for image worship. When Catholics are charged with worshipping images, as, for instance, images of Christ, they reply that they do not worship the image, but the One who is represented by it. That is just what is forbidden by the second commandment. Ancient heathenism originated in the same way.-God was thought to be *represented* by certain images, while the people knew that the images themselves were not God. This was the case with the Israelites when they made the golden calf. See also *Acts 17:29*. But such worship necessarily soon degenerated into the worship of the images. Making a graven or molten image, and putting it in a secret place, was one of the things against which a curse was pronounced. See *Deuteronomy 27:15.SITI May 26, 1887, page 314.7*

The second commandment manifests God's love and mercy. This shows that the law of God is a law of love. God gave his law in love, as we read: "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of his saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them. Yea, *he loved* the people." *Deuteronomy 33:2, 3*. As it is a law of love, so obedience to it is the test of love on our part; "for this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." *1 John 5:3.SITI May 26, 1887, page 314.8*

In the second commandment we have a refutation of the charge that the law was designed to be merely temporary. The iniquity of the fathers is, as a natural consequence, visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation, but the mercy of God is to be shown unto thousands of generations of them that love God and keep his commandments. Compare *Deuteronomy 7:9*. The world has not yet stood even half of a thousand generations, and so the commandments of God are still the test of loyalty to the Creator.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.1*

THIRD COMMANDMENT

"Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain." *Exodus 20:7*. This commandment forbids not only what is called "profane swearing," that is, the use of blasphemous oaths, but all irreverence. Substitutes for oaths which contain the name of God are condemned equally with the oaths themselves. By this commandment all "by-words" and unnecessary expletives, are forbidden.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.2*

This commandment may be violated even in worship. The unnecessary or vain use of titles belonging to Deity in prayer or exhortation, is taking the name of God in vain. Those who regard this commandment will not use the name of the Creator except when it is absolutely necessary, and then only with great reverence. The repetition of profane expressions which others have used, is also a violation of the commandment.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.3*

In *Psalms 138:2* we read: "Thou has magnified thy word above all thy name." Then irreverence for God's word, and disobedience of his commandments, are both violations of the third commandment. Perversion of Scripture, and the quoting of texts in jest or to give point to a joke, are gross violations of this commandment.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.4*

Still further, this commandment enjoins reverence for places of worship. The sanctuary of old was a sacred place where God's name was.*Deuteronomy 16:6*. To act irreverently in the sanctuary is to dishonor God. When the children of Israel were in captivity, God promised that he would be to them "a little sanctuary." *Ezekiel 11:16*. This was equivalent to the promise recorded in *Matthew 18:20*. Now a place that is sacred because of God's presence, should be regarded with reverence; and irreverent conduct in such a place is showing disrespect to God; and disrespect to God is a violation of the third commandment, and of the first as well.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.5*

FOURTH COMMANDMENT

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh

day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." *Exodus 20:8-11. SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.6*

On this commandment we have space for only a few points, whereas pages might be written. It is not because the commandment is obscure that so much might be written upon it, but because it is so comprehensive, and because so many people, either wilfully or through wrong education, misinterpret its plain terms. We ask the student to note these points:-*SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.7*

The Sabbath-day is *the seventh* day. Since the Sabbath is to be remembered, that is, it is of constant recurrence, it follows that "the seventh day" means the seventh day of a period of seven days. Hence it must mean the seventh day of the week. That this is so will be seen by comparing *Luke 23:54-56; 24:1*, where the Sabbath-day "according to the commandment" is the day before the first day of the week, and is, consequently, the seventh day of the week.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.8*

It is contended by some that the commandment does not enjoin rest on a specific seventh day, but on any day that has been preceded by six days of labor. This matter can be readily settled. In *Exodus 16* we have the account of the fall of the manna, where the terms "sixth day" and "seventh day" are employed. Now it is very evident that in this place the sixth day means the sixth day of the week, and the seventh day, the seventh day of the week. There is nobody who imagines that the Israelites were left to choose the day of their rest, or that the manna would keep over one day for one family or tribe, and would spoil at the same time for another family or tribe who might not have had the same day of rest. Thus, since the terms "sixth day" and "seventh day" refer to the week in this instance, they certainly must mean the same thing in the fourth commandment.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.9*

Further; all admit that it is necessary that there should be uniformity in the observance of the Sabbath. If each one were to choose the day that pleased him, there would be confusion. But how could this uniformity be secured? Not by the *dictum* of any man, for there is no man whose authority all men would recognize. God alone has authority in matters pertaining to morals, and he alone could direct which day shall be observed as the Sabbath. This he has done. "*The seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.10*

From the part of the commandment just quoted, it appears that the Sabbath-which is the name of the seventh day of the week-is the Lord's day. In *Isaiah 58:13* the Lord calls it his "holy day," and in *Mark 2:28* Christ declares himself to be Lord of the Sabbath. He was speaking to the Jews of the day which they observed; hence it is the seventh day of the week which is the Lord's day. This shows us the impropriety of calling the seventh day "the Jewish Sabbath." There is not, and never was, anything Jewish about it; it is the Lord's. But someone may say that it was given to the Jews, and they were required to keep it. So God made himself known to the Jews (*Exodus 3:13-16*), and declared himself to be their God; and they were required to worship him. But we do not therefore call Jehovah the Jewish God. He is the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. *Romans 3:20*. And since he is the God of the Gentiles, just the same as he is the God of the Jews, he requires the Gentiles to keep the same commandments, that he imposes on the Jews. And he promises rich blessings to the Gentiles who shall keep his Sabbath. *Isaiah 56:6, 7. W. SITI May 26, 1887, page 315.11*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

The Hebrews standard very aptly says: "There are lots of people who mix their religion with their business, but forget to stir it up well. As the result the business invariably rises to the top." Such a mixture is no better than none at all.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.1*

"Since these meetings opened," said Dr. Pentecost speaking of his Cleveland revival series, "fifty young women, and as many young men, have confessed Christ. And not one of those was from a worldly home. Why? It is the curse of unconsecrated property, and of this awful spirit of worldliness." Truthfully did the great Teacher say, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!"*SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.2*

The gifted writers for the *Homiletic Review* find exercise for their minds in the discussion of such subject as, "Where was the Creator before the creation?" The *Independent* disposes of this question in the following eminently sensible manner: "It is a good thing in reasoning the subject of religion, as well as upon other matters, to know what are the boundaries of human thought, and always keep within them. If we get beyond them, we simply overwhelm ourselves in the great deal of our own ignorance."*SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.3*

We are asked by a subscriber in an Eastern State, whether or not the Bible teaches that the Jews will all return to the land of Palestine just previous to the second coming of Christ. He also wishes us to give our views through the SIGNS, with all the Scripture references on the subject. At some future time we may furnish an article or two on the subject, but it would take more than one article to give all the Scripture references on the subject, with even the briefest comment. We can simply state the fact now, that the Bible does not teach that the Jews will go to Jerusalem before the coming of the Lord. All the passages which speak of the gathering of Israel refer either to the gathering after the Babylonian captivity or else to the gathering of the true Israel to the New Jerusalem, after the coming of the Lord. For a full exposition of this subject see pamphlet entitled, "Refutation of the Doctrine of the Age to Come," for sale at this office. See advertisement on the preceding page. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.4*

The Sunday closing law is being rigidly enforced in New York City. The *Observer* says of a recent Sunday that it "was probably the most quiet day that these cities [New York and Brooklyn] have seen in many years." Even the hotels refused to serve wine or other liquors to their guests, and it seems that prohibition does prohibit, at least on Sunday, which shows that it could also prohibit on every day. Morally it is no worse to sell liquors on Sunday than on Monday or Tuesday, but because so many people are idle on that day probably there is more drunkenness where liquor is sold freely, than on other days. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.5*

In this Sunday closing movement, however, we do not see zeal for the cause of temperance, but only legislation in behalf of Sunday. The power which can close saloons on Sunday, can close them every day of the week, if it is so inclined; and the fact that the zealous "reformers" of New York and Brooklyn can close saloons on Sunday, but allow liquor to be sold freely on every other day, shows that they have no special love for temperance. By their action they virtually say to the saloon-keeper, "Your business is all right, and we will find no fault with you, provided you do not pursue it on Sunday." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.6*

The San Francisco *Morning Call*, in answer to a question as to the possibility of keeping the Sabbath in all parts of the world, revives the old threadbare story that if a man who observes Saturday should start from San Francisco and go westward around the world, he would, on arriving at the starting-point, find himself keeping Sunday; but that if he went eastward, he would be keeping Friday. It was not long since that the *Argonaut* had something to the same effect. One would suppose that the writers of such stuff never heard that people do actually cross the ocean and go clear around the world. The fact that observers of the seventh day have crossed the Pacific Ocean in both directions, and each time have found themselves keeping Saturday when they landed, ought to convince anybody that the Sabbath can be kept anywhere. Yet notwithstanding this fact, and the fact that every month people are crossing the ocean from west to east and from east to west, and still find no hitch in their reckoning of the days of the week, certain wiseacres will persist in saying that the thing can't be done. Perhaps it is not to be wondered at, since there are still some people who believe that "The sun do move." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.7*

"Horrible Case of Hydrophobia" The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

The telegraph dispatches bring us full accounts of a hegira of New Yorkers, which took place on Sunday, May 15. Over 250,000 persons are reported to have fled to Jersey City and its suburbs on that day. The following description of the flight shows that the case was extremely urgent, and that the aroused populace did not stand upon the order of their going:—*SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.8*

"It was just about church-time when the extent of the exodus began to be manifested. On all the thoroughfares leading to the ferries there were seemingly endless processions of men, women, and children, on foot, and in carriages and street-cars. Around the ferry-houses they spread out into crowds, unceremoniously pushing and scrambling, in their efforts to get through the narrow spaces over which the fare-taker held sway. Even then their petty troubles were not over, for the number of berths was inadequate and people were compelled to remain from fifteen minutes to an hour in poorly ventilated and ill-smelling waiting-rooms." *SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.9*

But what was the cause of this impetuous flight? Had pestilence broken out in the city, and were the people fleeing for their lives? Not at all; they were going after a drink. What! was there no water in all the city of New York? Certainly; plenty of it, and of a very good quality, too. But no beer or whisky could be obtained in New York on that day, and those people were almost wild with the thought they might have to pass an entire day with nothing to drink but water. It was a warm day, and they were thirsty, so they fled from the pure Croton water, in order to find some liquor which would increase their thirst, thus enabling them to drink more liquor, to aggravate their thirst, in order to drink more liquor, etc. *SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.10*

Talk about hydrophobia! No brute, except the human brute, was ever afflicted with such a disease. Some unreasoning quadrupeds are occasionally afflicted with a disease which makes it impossible for them to drink

when they wish to, but they never fear the water, and they never substitute anything else for it. It is only beings that are made in the image of God, and endowed with faculties capable of the highest development, who can make a god of their belly, and glory in their shame. The old catechism evidently made a mistake in its definition of man's chief end. A modern catechism, if true to the times, would say that man's chief end is to glorify himself and to enjoy his depraved appetites. And still God lets the world stand.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.11*

"A Little Mixed" The Signs of the Times, 13, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian at Work* of May 12 gives its readers the astonishing information that "the Supreme Court of Tennessee has decided that a blacksmith belonging to a Christian sect that keeps the seventh instead of the first day of the week *as Sunday*, violates the law by working at his trade on the day observed by the general community as Sunday." Now we happen to know something about this case, and are sure that the Tennessee blacksmith does not belong "to a Christian sect that keeps the seventh instead of the first day of the week *as Sunday*." If there is any such sect the members composing it should be carefully collected, and placed in some house for the feebleminded.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.12*

There are thousands of Christian people who observe the seventh day of the week instead of the first, because it is the divinely appointed Sabbath, but that anybody keeps the seventh day *as Sunday*, is a figment of the imagination of people who fail to distinguish between the terms Sabbath and Sunday, and improperly use the one as a synonym of the other.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.13*

Sabbath is the name which the Bible gives to the seventh day of the week, while Sunday is the heathen name of the first day; and there is no more propriety in speaking of keeping the seventh day *as Sunday*, than there would be in speaking of keeping it as Monday or Friday. There are a great many people who keep Sunday as the Sabbath, which it is not, but it is safe to say that there is no sect the members of which keep the seventh day of the week *as Sunday*.*SITI May 26, 1887, page 320.14*

June 2, 1887

"Faith and Humility" The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

"For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." *Romans 12:3*. This text indicates that the greater a man's faith is, the less will he think of himself. As the apostle expresses it, he will "think soberly." Pride is intoxication. Just as alcohol stimulates a man without building him up, and finally deprives him of reason, so a man, to use a common expression, "loses his head" when he gets to hunting for the good traits in his character. And withal pride, like alcohol, furnishes no nourishment with which to build the man up. If a man is to grow strong, he must receive nourishment from a source outside of himself; but the vain person lives upon himself, and so becomes poorer by what he feeds upon. And as alcohol causes a man to stumble in his walk, and finally brings him to ruin, so "pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall." *Proverbs 16:18*. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.1*

So the apostle well describes humility as thinking soberly. But why will a man live soberly, according to the measure of faith which he possesses? The answer is not difficult. Faith is that which justifies the sinner. *Romans 5:1*. If men were not sinful, they would have no need of faith. The only reason for having faith in Christ is to secure pardon for past sins, and freedom from the love of sin. No man will exercise faith in Christ unless he feels himself to be a sinner. It is the sense of sin, which comes by the law, that drives a man to Christ that he may be justified by faith. Therefore for a man to confess Christ, is to acknowledge himself a sinner. Great diseases call for great remedies; the weaker a man is, the more aid will have to be given him. So the more the man feels his sinful condition, the more faith in Christ will he exercise. Therefore it is true that great faith on the part of any person is an evidence that that person feels that he is by nature very weak and sinful, and that without Christ he is nothing. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.2*

But such a feeling is in itself humility, which is nothing else but "a sense of one's own unworthiness through imperfection and sinfulness." Such a man estimates himself at his true value, which is nothing. And since faith in Christ cannot be exercised by any except those who "have no confidence in the flesh," it follows that the man who walks by faith will be a humble man. It is only when Christians lose their sense of unworthiness, and begin to look upon themselves with complacency, that they lose faith. When the individual is nothing in his own eyes, Christ is everything; but when he begins to rise in his own estimation, Christ sinks out of sight. Nothing can produce true humility but a knowledge of one's natural imperfections. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.3*

In harmony with these ideas, and the text first quoted, are the words of the prophet Habakkuk: "Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him; but the just shall live by his faith." *Habakkuk 2:4*. Faith and humility are inseparable. We ask again, Why does a man exercise faith in Christ? Simply because he feels a need of Christ; he has no confidence in his own strength, and feels that without Christ he must perish. It is not natural for the human heart to acknowledge another as superior. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." Independence, boastfulness, and self-conceit are natural to the human heart. But "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." He became a new creature in consequence of acknowledging his wretched sinfulness, and pleading for mercy through Christ. This in itself was a humiliation of soul. Now, so long as he continues in that state of justification by faith, he must retain a sense of his own unworthiness, for by the law of faith boasting is excluded. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.4*

Says the beloved disciple: "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." *1 John 5:4*. It is only as we exercise faith that God's strength supplies our lack, and keeps us from falling. And since faith and humility are so closely joined together, Bunyan has beautifully written, - *SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.5*

"He that is down needs fear no fall;
He that is low, no pride;
He that is humble ever shall
Have God to be his guide." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.6*

The man who is lifted up with pride and self-esteem must assuredly fall sooner or later, for the time will come when "the lofty looks of man shall be humbled," and the Lord alone exalted; but the man who is down cannot fall, for he is already as low as he can be. But such an one shall not always be abased. The promise is "Humble ourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up." *James 4:10*. Not in their own estimation, not in the estimation of the world, will such be lifted up, but they will be raised up to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. *Ephesians 2:6*. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.7*

"Thus saith the Lord, Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might,

let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the Lord which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the Lord." *Jeremiah 9:23, 24.SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.8*

"But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." *1 Corinthians 1:30, 31.SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.9*

Therefore "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." *Galatians 6:14. W.SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.10*

"They Stumbled at That Stumbling-stone" The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

Under the head of "Hasty Generalizations," the San Francisco*Evening Bulletin* says:-*SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.11*

"One of the delegates to the recent convention of the Young Men's Christian Association is reported to have said that nothing but the grace of God could save a young man in this city. The delegate to whom this remark is attributed may have been in San Francisco at the time for as long a period as forty-eight hours. How he could in that brief space have made so thorough an analysis of our social condition as to warrant the statement must remain a marvel." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.12*

One can hardly refrain from laughing as he imagines the honest indignation of the editor of the *Bulletin* when he penned his article repelling the base insinuation that it would require nothing less than the grace of God to save a San Francisco young man. But the matter has a serious side, in that it shows how ignorant many people-probably the great majority-are of even the necessity for a divine Saviour. The world has erected a fictitious standard of goodness, and the man who is "as good as the average," is esteemed a good fellow. It matters not that the average standard is falling lower and lower, they continue to judge themselves by themselves, and so rest satisfied with their condition. So complacent are they that they regard it almost an insult to be told that they never can be saved without divine assistance; and the minister who should repeat to one of them the words of Christ, "he that believeth not shall be damned," would be thought guilty of criminal libel.*SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.13*

It is impossible to imagine what would be thought if one should say that such persons are no better off than heathen, yet we have scriptural authority for just such a statement. Even the Jews who made their boast of the law, were told by Paul that they were no better than the licentious and depraved heathen, because both Jews and Gentiles are "all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one;" and that "there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." *Romans 3:9, 10, 22-24*. No man ever lived on earth who was good enough to be saved without the grace of God, and the man who, in his self-righteous pride, stumbles at that stumbling-stone, will in the end be no better off than the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah. See *Romans 9:20-32.SITI June 2, 1887, page 326.14*

"Exposition of 2 Corinthians 3:7-11" The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

Several questions have of late been asked us upon *2 Corinthians 3:7-11*. As that is a passage which those who are striving to teach the law often find difficult to explain, and which enemies of truth use with great confidence as being opposed to the law, we will try to give a simple scriptural exposition of it. The fifth and sixth verses of the chapter read as follows:-*SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.1*

"Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.2*

It will be noticed that the last clause of *verse 5* is an answer to the question, "Who is sufficient for these things?" asked in *verse 16* of the preceding chapter. The subject which is under consideration is the Christian ministry, as is seen by *verse 6*, and the *first verse of chapter 4*. The apostle is showing its excellence, and in so doing contrasts it with the ministry of the old covenant. The word "testament" in *verse 6*, means "covenant," and the statement is that we are made ministers of the new covenant; "not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Many people seem to have the idea that in this verse Paul is contrasting the two testaments or covenants. The old covenant they call the letter, and the new covenant the spirit. But

one who reads the verse carefully cannot fail to see that this is an error. The old covenant is not referred to till we reach the seventh verse. Paul's statement is simply to the effect that he and his associates were ministers of the spirit of the new covenant, and not of its letter; for the new covenant has its letter as well as the old. On this point Dr. Clarke makes the following pertinent comment:-*SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.3*

"Every institution has its letter as well as its spirit; as every word must refer to something of which it is the sign or signifier. The gospel has both its letter and its spirit, and multitudes of professing Christians, by resting in the letter, receive not the life which it is calculated to impart. Water, in baptism, is the letter that points out the purification of the soul; they who rest in this letter are without this purification; and dying in that state, they die eternally. Bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are the letter; the atoning efficacy of the death of Jesus, and the grace communicated by this to the soul of the believer, are the spirit. Multitudes rest in this letter, simply receiving these symbols without reference to the atonement or to their guilt; and thus lose the benefit of the atonement and the salvation of their souls.... It may be safely asserted that the Jews in no period of their history ever rested more in the letter of their law than the vast majority of Christians are doing in the letter of their gospel. Unto multitudes of Christians Christ may truly say, Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.4*

In the above quotation it is shown that the letter of the new covenant kills; but the reason why it kills will be made plain after we have made a brief comparison of the two covenants. These two covenants with their ministrations are brought to view in contrast in *verses 7 and 8*, which read thus:-*SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.5*

"But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?" *SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.6*

In this verse the old covenant is called the "ministration of death." Why it was so called is very apparent to one who understands what the old covenant was. We will state it briefly. Before the Lord gave the ten commandments from Mount Sinai, he said to the Jews:-*SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.7*

"Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel." *Exodus 19:4-5. SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.8*

On the third day after this, the Lord spoke the ten commandments in the hearing of all the people: "and he added no more; and he wrote them in two tables of stone." *Deuteronomy 5:22*. Then Moses went up to the Lord in the mount, and the Lord gave to him precepts growing out of the ten commandments. See *Exodus 21, 22 and 23*. The confirmation of the covenant, the preliminaries of which are given in *Exodus 19:5-8*, is related in *Exodus 24:3-8*. There learn that, *SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.9*

"Moses came and told the people all the words of the Lord, and all the judgments; and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the Lord hath said will we do." After this "Moses wrote all the words of the Lord;" and after he had built an altar and offered sacrifices, and read in the audience of the people; and they said, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." Then "Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold, the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." Thus was the covenant confirmed. We learn from this that the old covenant was simply an agreement between God and the children of Israel, concerning the commandments of God. The people on their part promised faithfully to keep the commandments, and the Lord promised to make of them a great nation. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.10*

In connection with this covenant there were "ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary," *Hebrews 9:1*. This sanctuary is described in *Exodus 25; 26, 27, and 30*, and the principal "ordinances of divine service," are described in *Exodus 29:38-42*, and *Leviticus, chapters 4 and 16*. With these facts before us, we may understand why the ministration of the first covenant was called a "ministration of death." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.11*

(1) In this covenant the people had made an explicit agreement to keep the law of God. (2) By this law is the knowledge of sin (*Romans 3:20*), "for sin is the transgression of the law." *1 John 3:4*. (3) The "ordinances of divine service" connected with the first covenant were for sin; but Paul tells us (*Hebrews 10:4*) that "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." Those "ordinances of divine service" were only "a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things," and therefore the sacrifices which the people offered had no power to make them perfect. Therefore (4) all who had to do with the old covenant alone were condemned to death; "for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (*Romans*

3:23); "and the wages of sin is death." *Romans 6:23*. There was in the old covenant no provision for the forgiveness of sins; therefore the ministration of that old covenant, which was performed by earthly priests, was, so far as their work extended, the ministration of death. Only the perfect can have life, and their ministration made nothing perfect. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.12*

It is true that during the time of the ministration of the old covenant, sins were forgiven (*Leviticus 4:26, 31, 35*), and this forgiveness was real, but it was obtained solely by virtue of faith in the promised sacrifice of Christ, and not because of anything in the old covenant. Paul says of Christ, in *Hebrews 9:15*, that "he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Thus we see that when sins committed under the first covenant were forgiven, they were forgiven by virtue of the second covenant. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.13*

Some stumble over the first clause of *2 Corinthians 3:7*, "The ministration of death, written and engraven in stones," but the Scriptures furnish means for the complete exposition of this. Paul cannot mean that the ministration was written and engraven in stones, for that would be impossible, because the ministration was the service of the priests. Then it must be that he means that death was written and engraven in stones. But some will say, "This makes nonsense of the text." Let us see. It is very easy to ascertain what was written and engraven in stone. *Exodus 31:18* says that the Lord "gave to Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God." "And Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand. The tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." *Exodus 32:15, 16*. These two tables were broken, and after Moses had, by the command of the Lord, made two other tables, he said, "And he [the Lord] wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly." *Deuteronomy 10:4*. These texts show that it was the ten commandments, and the ten commandments alone, that were written and engraven in stones; and therefore by the word "death," in *2 Corinthians 3:7*, Paul must refer to the ten commandments. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 327.14*

But is it allowable to speak of the ten commandments as "death"? Are they death to anybody? It certainly is allowable, for they are death to all men, because all have sinned, and the "wages of sin is death." The law is the cause of death to every sinner that shall perish, and so by metonymy it is called death. In like manner the sons of the prophets said of the poisonous gourds, "There is death [i.e., a cause of death] in the pot" (*2 Kings 4:40*); and the Lord said that "the tree of the field is man's life" (sustainer of life). *Deuteronomy 20:19*. So when Paul describes his conviction as a sinner, he says of the law, "And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." *Romans 7:10*. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.1*

Thus we find that in every case of the word, the ministration of the old covenant was "the ministration of death." We have found, then (1) that the law, which was the basis of the covenant, was death to all, and (2) that the ministration concerning that violated law offered no relief, but in itself tended to death. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.2*

Notwithstanding all this, there was a wonderful glory connected with the old covenant and its service. The giving of the law was attended with glory the like of which has never been seen on earth before or since, and will not be until the Lord shall come in the glory of his Father with all his angels. When Moses returned from the mount, his face was so glorified that the people could not look at it; and the glory of the Lord was present in the sanctuary to so great a degree that the priests were forced to obscure it with a cloud of incense, lest they should die. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.3*

Now let us briefly outline the new covenant. Paul says that this was established upon "better promises." Its terms are found in *Hebrews 8:8-12*, which reads thus:- *SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.4*

"For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.5*

We find here the same condition as in the old covenant, - the people are to obey the law of God. But this covenant is established on "better promises" than the first, in that the Lord promises to forgive their sins, to

write the law in their hearts, and to remember their iniquities no more. These things are all accomplished by virtue of Christ, who is the mediator of the new covenant. *Hebrews 8:6; 9:15*. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (*1 John 1:7*), by securing the remission of past sins (*Romans 3:24, 25*), and enabling us to walk in harmony with the law. *Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 2:10; Hebrews 13:20, 21*.SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.6

The law, then, is the basis of both covenants; hence it could not be done away with the old covenant, else there could be no new covenant. The terms of the new covenant leave no doubt on this point, and Christ's connection with it brings the fact out still more clearly. Thus Christ is the minister of this new covenant (*Hebrews 8:1, 2*) and is now performing the ministration in the true sanctuary in Heaven. *Hebrews 9:24*. His ministration has reference to the law, for he came to save sinners (*1 Timothy 1:15*), and he is offering his blood to save men from sin. *Romans 3:24; 1 John 1:7; Matthew 1:21*. This redemption we get through faith (*Romans 3:24*), and faith establishes the law. *Romans 3:31*. The law itself, having been violated, brings death; Christ redeems us from its curse (*Galatians 3:13*), and thus becomes our life. *Colossians 3:4*.SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.7

Now note the contrast between the two covenants: The first had the ministration of death, because everything connected with it tended to death; the violated law was death to the sinner, and the earthly ministration freed no one from that condemnation. The second covenant has the ministration of the Spirit, because "the Lord is that Spirit" (*2 Corinthians 3:17*), and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty and life. *Galatians 6:8*. But although there is no death in the second covenant, there is in the rejection of it, for the law is still death to sinners, and all who are opposed to Christ are sinners, and condemned to death; so Paul says that the letter of the new covenant kills. The reason is that holding the mere letter of the new covenant,-the performance of the gospel ordinances while not receiving Christ in the heart,-is really a rejection of Christ. Of the Lord's Supper, Paul says that he who does not discern the Lord's body, eats and drinks damnation to himself. *1 Corinthians 11:9*. He is in the same condition as though he had never heard of the new covenant. But in every case, whether of the sinner under the old covenant, or of one who rejects the new, it is the law that causes his death.SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.8

In the text under consideration Paul contrasts the two ministrations as to glory. If the ministration which could not cleanse from sin, was glorious, the ministration of the Spirit, which gives freedom from sin, must be more glorious. "If the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory." And so much more glorious is the ministration of the second covenant than that of the first, that in comparison the first covenant seems to have had no glory. Why the ministration of the second covenant should be so much more glorious than that of the first, is because it is established upon "better promises," and Christ is its minister.SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.9

"For if that which is done away was glorious, much more than which remaineth is glorious." *2 Corinthians 3:11*. Now what was done away? The answer must be that it is that which was glorious. *Verse 9* states that it was the ministration of condemnation that was glorious. Then it must be the ministration of condemnation that was done away; that which remains is the ministration of the Spirit. By no possibility can *verse 11* be made to refer to the law, because it contrasts something done away with something that remains. And we have found that the law is the basis of both covenants, and therefore it cannot have been done away; but the ministration of the old covenant as well as the covenant itself was done away, as was indicated by the fading glory upon the countenance of Moses. But it needs no abstract reasoning to show that it is the tabernacle service, and that alone, to which the apostle refers in *verse 11* as being "done away," for he says, "if that which is done away was glorious," showing by the "if" that he had before called attention to something glorious; and the only thing which he has so designated in this connection, is the ministration of death. *Verse 7*.SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.10

We think that any read who carefully follows this brief exposition will be able to see for himself, on reading *2 Corinthians 3:7-11* that the apostle is simply contrasting the glory of the service of the two covenants, and that the law of God is not under consideration at all, except by an incidental allusion which goes to show its permanent character. W.SITI June 2, 1887, page 328.11

"Importance of Obedience" The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

(Sabbath, June 18.)

1. When the angels are sent to gather God's elect, whom will they take?SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.1

"Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." *Psalms 50:5*.SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.2

2. What does God regard more highly than sacrifice?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.3*

"And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." *1 Samuel 15:22.SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.4*

3. How is disobedience described?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.5*

"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, He hath also rejected thee from being king." *Verse 23,SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.6*

4. When Samuel first came to Saul, how did the latter feel respecting what he had done?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.7*

"And Samuel came to Saul; and Saul said unto him, Blessed be thou of the Lord; I have performed the commandment of the Lord." *Verse 13.SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.8*

5. After Samuel reproved him, what did he say?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.9*

"And Saul said, They have brought them from the Amalekites; for the people spared the best of the sheep and of the oxen, to sacrifice and unto Lord thy God; and the rest we have utterly destroyed." *Verse 15.SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.10*

6. How was Saul deceived?*-He thought that by making a sacrifice to the Lord he would excuse him for not doing just as he had commanded.SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.11*

7. Was there any way by which the people would benefit themselves pecuniarily by this disobedience?*-They could use these cattle for sacrifice, and save their own for themselves.SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.12*

"But the people took of the spoil, sheep and oxen, and the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed, to sacrifice unto the Lord thy God in Gilgal." *Verse 21.SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.13*

8. What was the final result of Sauls course?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.14*

"And Samuel said unto him, The Lord hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbour of thine, that is better than thou. And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for he is not a man, that he should repent." "And Samuel came no more to see Saul until the day of his death; nevertheless Samuel mourned for Saul; and the Lord repented that he had made Saul king over Israel." *Verses 28, 29, 35.SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.15*

9. In what manner was the ark to be conveyed from place to place?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.16*

"But unto the sons of Kohath he gave none; because the service of the sanctuary belonging unto them was that they should bear upon their shoulders." *Numbers 7:9.SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.17*

10. By what means was it carried from the Philistines to Beth-shemesh?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.18*

"And the men did so; and took two milch kine, and tied them to the cart, and shut up their calves at home; and they laid the ark of the Lord upon the cart, and the coffer with the mice of gold and the images of their emerods." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.19*

11. How were strangers the nation for looking into the ark?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.20*

"And he smote the men of Bethshemesh, because they had looked into the ark of the Lord, even he smote of the people fifty thousand and threescore and ten men: and the people lamented, because the Lord had smitten many of the people with a great slaughter." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.21*

12. What arrangements did David make for taking the ark from the house of Abinadab?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.22*

"And they set the ark of God upon a new cart, and brought it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah; and Uzzah and Ahio, the sons of Abinadab, drave the new cart." "And David and all the house of Israel played before the Lord on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.23*

13. Why was Uzzah smitten by the Lord?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.24*

"And when they came unto the threshingfloor of Chidon, Uzza put forth his hand to hold the ark; for the oxen stumbled. And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzza, and he smote him, because he put his hand to the ark: and there he died before God." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.25*

14. What was the real sin here committed? *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.26*

"For because he did it not at the first, the Lord our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought him not after the due order." *1 Chronicles 15:13. SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.27*

15. When the ark was removed from the house of Obededom, in what manner was it carried? *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.28*

"So the priests and Levites sanctified themselves to bring up the ark of the Lord God of Israel. And the children of the Levites bare the ark of God upon their shoulders with the staves there on, as Moses commanded, according to the word of the Lord." *Verses 14, 15. SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.29*

16. If God's miraculous care was over the ark when it was brought from the Philistines on a cart, why was he displeased when it was placed upon a new cart prepared expressly for that purpose by David? See notes. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.30*

17. What practical lesson can be learned from this? *Although men may have zeal and care for God's cause, the Lord will not except that in the place of obedience. SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.31*

NOTES

It is a great mistake to presume that our property or anything we possess belongs to us to use upon our lusts. Whatever talents men possess, either natural or acquired, are loaned them of God, and those who are not faithful in that which has been loaned them will never receive the true riches which Christ has purchased for us; for if we have not been faithful in that which is another man's, none will give us that which is our own. Nothing in this life belongs to us, but an inheritance to eternal life in the kingdom of God has been purchased for us by Christ. We were God's by creation, and after having lost the privilege of children by the fall, we have been purchased or redeemed by the blood of Christ. We have no right, therefore, to devote our powers or possessions to our own selfish interests. Every sacrifice made to the glory of God will meet its reward in the kingdom of God. Hence God will except nothing but that obedience which proceeds from the heart. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.32*

Saul was a rash man, and his case fitly illustrates the course of many professed Christians at the present time. Although apparently conscientious, he was impetuous, and could not wait for God's providence being brought into straitened circumstances. He had never learned the important lesson of quiet trust in God, and in consequence, his entire life was one of fitfulness. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.33*

"Saul had not a high and exalted sense of the excellence and terrible majesty of God. He had not a sacred regard for his appointed ordinances. With an impetuous spirit because Samuel did not appear at the appointed time, he rushed before God presumptuously, and undertook the sacred work of sacrifice. While equipped for war, he built the altar and officiated for himself and the people. This work was sacredly given to those appointed for the purpose. This act was a crime in Saul, and such an example would lead the people to have a low estimate of the religious ceremonies and ordinances sanctified and appointed of God, prefiguring the sinless offering of his dear Son. God would have his people have a holy regard and sacred reverence for the sacrificial work of the priests, which pointed to the sacrifice of his Son." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.34*

"God proved Saul by intrusting him with the important commission to execute his threatened wrath upon Amalek. But he disobeyed God, and spared the wicked, blasphemous king Agag, whom God had appointed unto death, and spared the best of the cattle. He destroyed utterly all the refuse that would not profit them. Saul thought it would add to his greatness to spare Agag, a noble monarch splendidly attired; and that to return from battle with him captive, with great spoil of oxen, sheep, and much cattle, would get to himself much renown, and cause the nations to fear him, and tremble before him. And the people united with him in this. They excused their sin among themselves in not destroying the cattle, because they could reserve them to sacrifice to God, and spare their own cattle to themselves." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.35*

"Samuel informed Saul that his rebellion was as the sin of witchcraft. That is, when one commences to travel in the path of rebellion, he yields himself to be controlled by an influence that is in opposition to the will of God. Satan controls the rebellious mind. Those who are thus controlled lose a calm trust in God, and have less and less disposition to yield loving obedience to his will. Satan becomes more and more familiar with them, until they seem to have no power to cease to rebel. In this respect, rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.36*

"Saul's stubbornness in persisting before Samuel that he had obeyed God, was an iniquity and idolatry. His love to carry out his own will was more desirable to him than to obtain the favor of God, or the approbation of a clear conscience. And when his sin was opened clearly before him, and his wrong definitely pointed out, his pride of opinion, his excessive self-love, led him to justify himself in his wrong course, in defiance of the reproof of Samuel, and the word of the Lord by the mouth of his prophet. Such obstinacy in a known transgression, separated him forever from God." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.37*

"He knew that he had gone contrary to God's express command; yet when reproved by God through Samuel, he would not humbly acknowledge his sin, but in a determined manner uttered a falsehood in self-justification. If he had humbly repented, and received the reproof, the Lord would have had mercy and forgiven Saul of his great sin. But the Lord left Saul for his stubbornly refusing to be corrected, and for uttering falsehoods to Samuel, his messenger. Samuel told Saul that, as he had rejected the word of the Lord, God had rejected him from being king." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.38*

There is one thing noticeable in the case of Uzzah's being smitten before the Lord. It cannot be said that David did not have a proper sense of the sacredness of the ark. It seems that a new cart was especially prepared upon which to convey the ark. It probably had never been used for any other purpose. David also sang and gave praises before the ark with all his might. But the sin committed was in the disregard of the law which said that the ark should be borne by the priests. Uzzah was a Levite but not a priest. All the circumstances seemed to be in harmony with the mind of God except this provision for carrying the ark upon a cart, instead of by the proper means, which would have avoided all danger, such as Uzzah apprehended from the stumbling of the oxen, and the shaking of the ark. This incident illustrates the grand truth that a conscientious zeal never can take the place of obedience in God's sight. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.39*

Another important truth is brought out by this circumstance, namely, that God does not hold people responsible when they do not have the light. God's miraculous providence was over the ark when it was first sent to Beth-Shemesh, although it was then drawn upon a cart; for the Philistines had no knowledge of how the ark should be carried; but to the people of Israel, God had made known the manner in which he was pleased to have it conveyed. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 331.40*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

One of Oakland's wholesale wine merchants, who certainly is qualified to speak understandingly, says that "more wine is being used in families than ever before." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.1*

At Sacramento, Cal., tent-meetings are being conducted by Elder E. R. Jones, with a good interest and steady attendance. The tent is located on the corner of Sixteenth and I Streets. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.2*

A question that was asked concerning a point in the prophecy of the eight and ninth of Daniel was answered for this number of the SIGNS, but the answer was necessarily held over until next week, on account of pressure of other matter. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.3*

We hope that none of our readers will skip the Home Circle Department this week. It does not contain a story, but it is filled full of good sound sense which will profit all who will heed it. Parents and children both should read it. Don't skip it because it is long, and doesn't look like a story. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.4*

We call special attention to the article on the preceding page, concerning the canvassing work. A perusal of it should convince anyone that in spite of the great demand for trashy reading, a living may be made even now by selling good books,—books that are devoted solely to expositions of Scripture. And how much better a man, must feel after selling a good book, which the people need, than after selling something that is worse than nothing. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.5*

Those who have asked for an explanation of *2 Corinthians 3:7* and onward, will find it in the body of the paper this week. We have no idea that the subject is made so plain that anybody can understand it without the exercise of any thought; but we think that a careful reading of this article, and perhaps a little study, will enable any reader to arrive at an understanding of the text. The article is not by any means exhaustive, and if after carefully reading it anyone should find himself still in the dark on any point, we shall be glad to give the matter further consideration, if he will let us know what his difficulty is. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.6*

We have received a letter from a gentleman in San Francisco giving his ideas on evolution, and asking that we state our views on the same subject; or, as our questioner himself puts it: "I ask that you will kindly state what are your views upon the deductions and upon the ideas, or theories, of scientific men, based on scientific facts." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.7*

To answer this question fully would require far too much time and space. We can only say that we have no faith whatever in evolution; it is contrary to the word of God; and as it is not possible that any *fact* should contravene the word of God, the "deductions" of scientific men concerning it are not "based on scientific *facts*." The world is full of unbelief and all manner of wickedness, but the Bible is full of precious truths which are able to make us "wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Paul exhorts Timothy to "avoid profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so-called," and we cannot do better than to heed the admonition. *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.8*

The comprehensiveness of the law of God attests its divine origin. Men make laws, and find after a while that they have to be amended. Why? Because circumstances arise which the framers of the laws did not foresee. But the law of God needs no amending, for infinite wisdom foresaw every circumstance that might arise, and framed commandments which covered every possible case. Take the sixth commandment as a sample. Hatred and anger are violations of this commandment. See *Matthew 5:21, 22; 1 John 3:15*. Now if the Lord had simply forbidden anger or hatred, or some other thing which the commandment forbids, he would have had to multiply commandments to cover every phase of sin. But it is an axiom that the greater includes the less, and therefore the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," forbids not only the actual taking of human life, but every thought which if cherished and allowed to work itself out would result in murder. Everything of human make is narrow and imperfect, but the commandment of God "is exceeding broad." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.9*

Very often after a discourse we hear some person say, "I liked that sermon; it is just what I have always believed." This is usually said with an air which indicates that the speaker thinks he has given the preacher and his sermon a wonderful compliment. It is, in fact, nothing of the kind; the person is simply complimenting himself, and, like all who compliment themselves, he thereby reveals a state of mind which is not at all praiseworthy. When he says he believes, he indicates that no matter how scriptural the sermon might be, he would not like it if it contained ideas contrary to his former belief. It shows a trace of that spirit which Paul said should be so common in the last days, which shall lead men to heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts. *2 Timothy 4:3*. Happy is the hearer whose honest desire is to "hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord," and who will like every scriptural discourse or printed article, even though it is contrary to his preconceived ideas; and happy is that preacher who, regardless of the *likes* of the people, will heed the command of God, to go and preach "the preaching that I bid thee." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.10*

We are told that the new Andover theory in regard to future probation "is working serious injury to the life and activity of the churches." What else could be expected? If those who have "not had a fair chance" in this life are sure of having the gospel preached to them, after death, in greater purity than it could possibly be done by mortal men, why should the churches worry themselves over the condition of the heathen either at home or abroad? And why should the unconverted be anxious to improve present gospel privileges? The doctrine of probation after death is one of the lies which Satan has invented to strengthen the hands of the wicked, "that he should not return from his wicked way." *Ezekiel 13:22. SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.11*

"Evolution vs. the Bible" The Signs of the Times, 13, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

A lecture on "Evolution" was delivered in San Francisco one evening last week by Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, said to be the one "who discovered, independently of Darwin, the laws of evolution." He claimed that "any other than an animal origin for man's body is inconceivable and contradictory." This proposition he proceeded to "demonstrate" in the following manner:—*SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.12*

"If all other animal forms have been derived from one another by the natural processes which have been pointed out, and which has brought up the animal structure so near to that of man that, as Prof. Owen remarked, to define what distinguishes the ape from the man is the anatomist's difficulty, how can he suppose that the final steps never occurred at all, but that by an entirely new process of creation, of which there is no shadow of a proof, man sprang, *de novo*, into existence, yet bearing in every part of his structure countless indications of his animal origin? To believe this is to believe that the Creator of man created him so as to mislead us, and is, to any unprejudiced mind who will study the facts, utterly incredible." *SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.13*

We suppose that in such demonstrations the "if" is spoken under the breath, so that the condition shall have the appearance of an axiom. If the lower animals have been derived from one another by successive steps, then it is incredible but that man must have been similarly derived! Well, we will accept that, but how are we to know that the lower animals were derived from one another by passing from lower to higher forms? Why, we must take that for granted, to be sure; we must accept it because "there is no shadow of proof" that the various animals sprang into existence by a new process of creation. So Dr. Wallace tells us. But must we throw aside that ancient record which says that in the first week of time God caused the waters and the earth

to bring forth every living creature, and that out of the dust of the ground he "created man in his own image?" Why, certainly, if you are going to accept evolution; for you must know to begin with that evolution has no use for anything so old-fashioned as the Bible.*SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.14*

Yet many professed Christians accept the doctrine of evolution! What can be the condition of men who will exchange the "full assurance of faith," by which "we know that the worlds were framed by the word of God," for a theory which entirely denies the Bible, and has no stronger foundation than an "if"?*SITI June 2, 1887, page 336.15*

June 9, 1887

“Blessed Are They that Do” The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

It is probable that there is no word in the Bible the meaning of which is more generally misunderstood than the word “conversation.” The reason is that the meaning of the word has changed since the authorized version was made, and the word is now used in a much more restricted sense than it was used with reference to one’s general deportment. From a failure to recognize the fact that the word is used in the Bible in a sense which is now obsolete, many lose very much of the force of the texts in which it occurs. A little examination of the principal texts in which the word is found cannot fail to be profitable, on account of the practical truths which they contain. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.1*

The first time the word occurs in the Bible is *Psalms 37:14*: “The wicked have drawn out the sword, and have bent their bow, to cast down the poor and needy, and to slay such as be of upright conversation.” The margin has the correct rendering: “The upright of way.” The idea of this text is the same as that of *verse 12*: “The wicked plotteth against the just, and gnasheth upon him with his teeth;” or that stated by Paul in *2 Timothy 3:12*: “All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.” *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.2*

In *Psalms 50:23* we have the word again: “Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me; and to him that ordereth his conversation aright will I show the salvation of God.” Here, as before, the correct idea is given in the margin. It should read: “To him that disposeth his way aright, will I show the salvation of God.” This gives a much broader meaning to the text. When we remember that the Judgment will take cognizance not only of words and actions, but of the thoughts, we find that the word here rendered “conversation” covers every duty. They who dispose their way aright, are “the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord” (*Psalms 119:1*), and the promise in *Psalms 50:23* is equivalent to the statements in *Matthew 19:17* and *Revelation 22:14*, that they who keep the commandments will be saved. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.3*

The next occurrence of the word is in *Galatians 1:13*: “For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews’ religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it.” Here it is absolutely impossible that the word should be limited to talk. Paul’s wasting of the church of God was not idle talk, but stern reality. He says that his “conversation” when he professed the Jews’ religion was to persecute the church. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.4*

Again we read: “That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts.” *Ephesians 4:22*. Here it is obvious that “manner of life,” as it is in the revised version, or “practices,” as the Syriac version has it, expresses the sense much more perfectly. The “old man” is the “body of sin” (*Romans 6:6*), and Paul means that the “former conversation” which is to be “put off,” is the past course of sin. In contrast with this “conversation” which is to be “put off,” is the “new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” (*Ephesians 4:24*), which is to be “put on.” “Righteousness and true holiness” do not consist of talk, but of deeds, and so that which is “put off” to make room for these, consists of deeds. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.5*

The same meaning attaches to the word in *Ephesians 2:3*, where the apostle, after speaking of the children of disobedience, says: “Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh fulfilling the desires of the flesh and the mind.” He does not mean that once we simply talked with the children of disobedience, but that our manner of life, including words, thoughts, and actions, was the same as theirs. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.6*

1 Timothy 4:12 shows that the word means more than simply talk. Paul exhorts Timothy to be an example “in word, in conversation, in charity.” “In word” covers all that he may say, but “in conversation” indicates the whole behavior. It is not enough that a minister should talk well both in the pulpit and out, but his behavior must correspond. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.7*

In the thirteenth of Hebrews the word occurs twice. In *verse 5* we read: “Let your conversation be without covetousness.” Covetousness is a sin of the mind, and not of words. The rendering, “Be ye free from the love of money,” or, “Let your turn of mind be free from love of money,” is much more in accordance with the nature of covetousness, and with the exhortation which immediately follows, “And be content with such things as ye have.” *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.8*

Verse 7 of Hebrews 13 might with more reason be thought to have reference to words, if we did not know that the usage of the Bible is in favor of a more comprehensive application. When the Bible was translated, it is not probable that the word “conversation” was rendered in its present limited sense. It was then used in the sense of the Latin word from which it is derived, namely “turning about,” indicating all the turns of one’s life, or in

other words his way or manner of life. So in this text when the apostle says, "Remember them which have the rule over you, ... considering the end of their conversation," he means that we should consider the object of their manner of life, why it is that they live as they do. The same thought is expressed in *Philippians 3:17*; *1 Corinthians 4:16*; *1 Thessalonians 1:6*. SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.9

In *1 Peter 1:15*, 18 it is very clear that if "manner of life" or "conduct" be substituted for "conversation," the text will read more smoothly, and the one who has always limited the word "conversation" to mere talk, will find a deeper meaning to the text than ever before. SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.10

In *2 Peter 2:7* it is very evident if we regard the context that something more than talk is meant. The text says that just Lot was "vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked." Now there can be no doubt but that the Sodomites were obscene and vulgar in their talk, but *verse 8* is explanatory of *verse 7*, and that says: "For that righteous man dwelling among them, *in seeing and hearing*, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their *unlawful deeds*." Here it is shown that the word "conversation" covers both speaking and doing. In this connection it is well to remember that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh" (*Matthew 12:34*) and that as a man "thinketh in his heart so is he." *Proverbs 23:7*. So that is a man's words are evil, it is very certain that his deeds will be no better. SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.11

2 Peter 3:11: "Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness," is often quoted to show that in these last days our talk ought to be pure and elevated. So it ought, but the text teaches vastly more than that. Many people whose talk is faultless will be left outside the kingdom of God. What Peter wants to impress is the thought that in view of the soon coming of Christ our whole conduct should be holy. SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.12

The faulty rendering of *Philippians 3:20* has caused many, perhaps the majority of persons, to lose the force and beauty of that text. It reads: "For our conversation is in Heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ." Now our talk may be of a heavenly nature, or about heavenly things, but it would be absolutely impossible for us to have it in Heaven unless we ourselves were there. When we get to Heaven, our talk will of necessity be there, but not till then. The word here rendered "conversation" is *politeuma*, and means "commonwealth," or "citizenship." The reader will no doubt at a glance see the truth of this, since *politeuma* must bring to his mind the word "political," which has reference to governments. SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.13

In the passage in which this text occurs, the apostle tells the brethren how they ought to walk, or live. The reason why we should not live like the enemies of the cross of Christ, but should reach forth unto those things which are before, is that this world is not our home, but that our citizenship is in Heaven, and we should live as would become people of such high birth. We are not dwellers here upon this earth, therefore we should not live "according to the course of this world;" but if we have been born of the Spirit, we are only sojourners here. In Heaven we have an enduring substance, "a city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." If we are "called to be saints," we are sons of God, and ought to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called. If we should live like the children of disobedience, we should deny our royal birth. The thought that our citizenship is in Heaven, that our names are enrolled in the Great Register of that country, should lead us to study the laws of that place, that we may know how to conduct ourselves when we go there. And since we cannot conduct ourselves properly there unless we have learned how here, it follows that a proper understanding of this text constantly borne in mind will serve as a great incentive to holy living. This is the only place in the Bible where the word rendered "conversation" has this meaning. SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.14

These are not all the instances of the occurrence of the word "conversation" in the common version, but they are the principal ones. It is not merely as a matter of curiosity that one should understand the proper sense of this word in the various places where it occurs, but that he may get the full meaning of the texts in which it is found. Let us be careful not to narrow the sense of the Scriptures, nor give words a meaning which they do not possess. Let us also remember that the Bible lays far more stress on deeds than on words; for while a good talker may be a very poor liver, it will invariably be the case that "a good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things." The man whose works are committed to the Lord, will have his thoughts established; and the man whose thoughts are pure will talk accordingly. W. SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.15

"Unity of the Eighth and Ninth of Daniel" The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

That there is the most intimate connection between the eighth and ninth chapters of Daniel, must be patent to anybody who reads that book with even ordinary attention. The eighth chapter records a vision which the prophet had "in the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar." In that vision Daniel saw the last three great universal empires of the world, under the symbols of a ram, a goat, and a little horn; and at the close, he heard one angel, in reply to the question, "How long shall be the vision?" say, "Unto two thousand and three

hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." Then the angel Gabriel received the divine command, "Make this man to understand the vision," which he at once proceeded to do. He briefly, yet comprehensively, sketched the course of empires from the rise of the Medo-Persian Empire to the overthrow of the Roman power. *Verses 20-25 of chapter 8* cover the interpretation of what Daniel saw, and in *verse 25* the angel begins the interpretation of what Daniel heard. Said he, "And the vision of the evening and the morning [compare margin of *verse 14*] is true." Then Daniel fainted, and the angel was obliged to postpone any further explanation. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.16*

The commission which the angel had received remained, however, in full force, and Daniel himself was not the one to rest quietly with the vision unexplained. In the first year of Darius, Daniel knew that the time of the captivity of the Jews in Babylon had nearly expired, and thinking, doubtless, that his vision in the third year of Belshazzar, part of which was still unexplained, applied to this time, he engaged in earnest prayer to God. *Verses 4-19* of the ninth chapter of Daniel record this prayer, and in the twentieth verse the prophet begins:-*SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.17*

"And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the Lord my God for the holy mountain of my God; yea, whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved; therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision." *Daniel 9:20-23. SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.18*

Now note these points: 1. Part of the vision of the eighth chapter was still unexplained. 2. Daniel was pleading for light upon this unexplained portion, as is evident from *verse 22*. 3. The same angel who had received the commission to make Daniel understand the vision, and who had partially done his work, now came the second time. 4. Daniel identifies him as "the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning," an obvious reference to "the vision" of *chapter 8:5*. Almost the first thing the angel said was, "understand the matter, and consider the vision." What vision? Why, the only one that needed considering, the only one to which such matter-of-fact reference could possibly be made, - the vision recorded in the eighth *chapter. 6*. And lastly, without any further introduction, the angel began the explanation by saying, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people," etc. The point in the vision where he had ceased his explanation, was the time portion, and right there he begins. These facts prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that *verses 24-27* of *Daniel 9* are the completion of the explanation of the vision of *Daniel 8. SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.19*

The question now arises in many minds, "How long a period of time intervened between the two parts of the interpretation?" This is really an unimportant matter, but since it is asked, it is proper to answer it as well as may be done. According to the chronology of Usher, which is found in the margin of our Bibles, it was fifteen years. The date B.C. 553, in the margin of chapter 8, is based on the supposition that Belshazzar's reign began in B.C. 555. If that were true his third year would be 553. But comparatively recent explorations show that Belshazzar was not upon the throne of Babylon so early as 555 B.C. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.20*

There has always been a little obscurity about Belshazzar. The fact that Nabonadius was the only name mentioned in the ancient records as coming to the throne of Babylon in 555 B.C., led many historians to discredit the Bible narrative, which speaks of Belshazzar as king; while commentators generally bridged the difficulty by claiming that Nabonadius and Belshazzar were two names for the same man. Thus the matter rested until scholars learned to read the cuneiform inscriptions, when it was discovered that Nabonadius was indeed king of Babylon from B.C. 555 to B.C. 538, and that Belshazzar was his son, whom he associated with himself in the empire, in order that opposition to the encroachments of the Persians under Cyrus, might be made from different points at the same time. By this discovery, the Bible was proved to be historically accurate, and Bible scholars learned why Belshazzar made Daniel only the *third* ruler in the kingdom. *Daniel 5:29*. It was the highest position to which Daniel could be raised. Nabonadius was first, Belshazzar was second, and Daniel was made third. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.21*

If now we can tell at what date Belshazzar became joint ruler with his father, we can easily determine the length of time between the third year of his reign and the first year of Darius. But that cannot be done with exactness. The "Encyclopedia Britannica" says that "all that is known with any certainty on the matter will be found in Rawlinson's "Great Monarchies." Without entering into details as to how he arrives at his conclusions, we will state that Rawlinson regards Belshazzar as the son of a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, whom Nabonidius married after he became king. See in "Seven Great Monarchies," chapter eight (and notes) of Fourth Monarch. He says of Nabonadius: "At the earliest possible moment-probably when he [i.e., Belshazzar] was about fourteen-he had associated with him in the government his son Belshazzar, or Belshar-ezer, the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar.... He was young and inexperienced, but he had the counsels of the queen-mother to guide and support him, as well as those of the various lords and officers of the court." *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.22*

If Rawlinson's date is correct, the third year of Belshazzar's reign was his last; and the time between the giving of the vision of the eighth of Daniel, and the first year of Darius, when the interpretation was completed, was very short. Not more than a year could have separated the two installments of the interpretation, and without doubt the whole of the transaction occurred in the same year. This serves to bind the two chapters under consideration almost as closely together in point of time as they obviously are in subject. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.23*

The actual time, however, between the two portions of the interpretation, is, as we have already intimated, a matter of comparatively little importance. There is no escaping the conclusion that the ninth of Daniel is a continuation of the eighth, and the student can connect *verse 24 of chapter 9 with verse 26 of chapter 8*, and follow the interpretation through without a break. So far as the interpretation is concerned, it makes no difference whether the time between the two parts of it was fifteen years or fifteen minutes. The close connection between the two chapters having been demonstrated, the student or expositor should drop all thoughts of the time occupied in interpreting the vision, and read *Daniel 8:20-26; 9:24-27* as one continuous narrative. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.24*

This explanation may serve as an aid to some in the study of one of the most important prophecies of the Bible. W. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 342.25*

"The Commentary. God Requires Strict Obedience" The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.
(June 26.-Leviticus 10:1-11; Exodus 35:20-29.)

"And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the Lord, which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is it that the Lord spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron held his peace. And Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Come near, carry your brethren from before the sanctuary out of the camp. So they went near, and carried them in their coats out of the camp; as Moses had said. And Moses said unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto Ithamar, his sons, Uncover not your heads, neither rend your clothes; lest ye die, and lest wrath come upon all the people: but let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning which the Lord hath kindled. And ye shall not go out from the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; for the anointing oil of the Lord is upon you. And they did according to the word of Moses. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 346.1*

"And the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations; and that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean; and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses." *SITI June 9, 1887, page 346.2*

There are two or three points in this portion of Scripture which the student should not fail to notice. The first and most important is that God is very particular, and will not countenance any deviation from directions which he has given. He had specified the kind of fire and incense that should be used in the sanctuary. *Exodus 30:9*. He himself had kindled a fire on the altar when the first offering was made upon it, and no other was to be used. It might have seemed to Nadab and Abihu that there was no difference between the sacred fire and ordinary fire; but God had made them different, and it was their duty to recognize that difference. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 346.3*

It may seem to many that death was a severe penalty for so slight a deviation from the commandment of the Lord; such must remember that the fact that the death penalty was inflicted by the Lord himself, is sufficient evidence that the offense was not small. The Judge of all the earth will do right. It must also be borne in mind that the heinousness of a sin is not determined so much by the actual quality of the deed itself, as by the spirit in which the deed is committed. Contempt for the Lord may be shown in the willful disobedience of a supposed minor precept, as well as by some act which would be generally recognized as a sin. But the sin of Nadab and Abihu was not a small one. It was the result of lightly regarding the service of the Lord. They engaged in his service as carelessly as they would in some business of their own; and this showed that they had no real reverence for God. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 347.1*

The same reasoning that Nadab and Abihu may be supposed to have used is indulged in by thousands of people to-day in regard to the Sabbath. The fourth commandment says: "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep

it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; for the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work;" and it gives as a reason for this, the fact that is stated in *Genesis 2:3*, that "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it [made it holy]; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Yet in the face of this, there are people who say that there is no difference in days, and that one day is just as good as another; that since all days are alike, it makes no difference which day we observe as, Sabbath, providing it is one day in seven. There is just the same difference that there was in the fire. The two kinds of fire no doubt looked just alike. But one was not holy and the other was. It was holy because God had made it so. So all days look alike; but they are not all alike, for God has made the seventh day holy. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 347.2*

Refusal to obey any commandment of the Lord, is evidence of a lack of respect for him. In *Ezekiel 22:26* the Lord through the prophet says of the church, "Her priests have violated my law, and have profaned mine holy things; they have put no difference between the holy and profane, neither have they showed difference between the unclean and the clean, and have hid their eyes from my Sabbath, and I am profaned among them." Her hiding the eyes from the Lord's Sabbath is counted as the same sin that Nadab and Abihu committed. Moreover, the Lord says that he is *profaned* because the people have not put difference between the holy and the profane, but have violated his holy Sabbath. This is because God has magnified his word above all his name (*Psalms 138:2*); disregard of his word dishonors him; and for a man to treat the Lord with disrespect is as bad as to speak disrespectfully of him. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 347.3*

Some may say that the Lord is not so particular now as he used to be, because he does not destroy people for making no difference between the day which he has sanctified, and common days. This illustrates what Solomon said: "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." *Ecclesiastes 8:11*. But God says, "I am the Lord, I change not." He is just as particular now as he ever was. But at no time in the history of the world has he executed summary punishment upon all transgressors. If he had, there would have been no people left on earth. Occasionally he has suddenly cut off some terribly presumptuous person, but those were only exceptional cases. "He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness" (*Acts 17:31*), and he has reserved the unjust "unto the day of Judgment to be punished." *2 Peter 2:9*. The instances in which God has summarily cut off transgressors are simply reminders of how he regards disobedience to his plain requirements. Let us therefore not tempt the Lord, but on the contrary, seek earnestly to know what his will is, and then with diligence do all his commandments. Upon all such a blessing is pronounced. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 347.4*

The passage of Scripture upon which we are commenting is also a temperance lesson. After Nadab and Abihu were destroyed "the Lord spake unto Aaron, saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die; it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations; and that ye may put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean." This seems to indicate that Nadab and Abihu had been drinking wine before they went into the sanctuary, and that this was the cause of their sin. From this we learn that God does not regard drunkenness as an excuse for crime. If a man commits a murder when he is crazed with liquor which he voluntarily drank, he is as guilty as though the crime were premeditated; because he of his own accord took that which he knew would deprive him of reason. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 347.5*

Whether or not Nadab and Abihu were thoroughly intoxicated, we cannot tell, but we know that their sensibilities were blunted. How many there are who engage in the work of the Lord with their mental faculties all deadened because of intemperance in eating or drinking. Such cannot appreciate the plain word of God. And it is largely because of gross habits that people cannot sense the importance of sacred things. Both their mental and their moral faculties are blunted, so that they can see no difference between things holy and things common. But people who cannot see the truth, because their own wrong habits have blunted their senses, are just as accountable for their disobedience as though they could see the truth and should willfully disobey it. To all the exhortation comes, "Be not drunk with wine wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit." *SITI June 9, 1887, page 347.6*

Attention is called to just one point taught by *Exodus 35:26-29*. That is that "everyone whose heart stirred him up, and everyone whom his spirit made willing," brought an offering for the sanctuary; God had told Moses to take an offering only "of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart." *Exodus 25:2*. The result of this willing offering is given in *Exodus 36:2-7*. The people brought unto Moses "free offerings every morning," until the overseers of the work said to him, "The people bring much more than enough for the service of the work, which the Lord commanded to make. And Moses gave commandment, and they caused it to be proclaimed throughout the camp, saying, Let neither man nor woman make any more work for the ordering of the sanctuary. So the people were restrained from bringing. For the stuff they had was sufficient for all the work to make it, and too much." Such a thing as this is of rare occurrence, but it would not be if the people who profess to be God's would all give willingly and make free offerings. The cause of God would prosper, and all would be blessed. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 347.7*

We cannot help thinking that there were some in the camp of Israel who had not given anything when the proclamation went forth that no more offerings were needed. There are always some who do not intend to give anything. To such it would make no difference whether there was enough or not. Such ones would doubtless congratulate themselves on their prudence, since they had saved their means, and the cause was well supplied besides. But there are always others who do intend to give, but not now. They cling to their means yet a little longer, but fully design to make a liberal donation at some future time. How disappointed such ones must have felt when they learned that their offerings were not needed. So it will doubtless be in these last days. God's work will close without having been helped by many who designed to help sometime. Too late they will find that while the work of the Lord could get along without their help, they cannot get along without helping the work. The lesson that we should learn is never to put off service of any kind for the Lord. To-day is the call to everyone. *W.SITI June 9, 1887, page 347.8*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

The report of the proceedings of the North Pacific Conference is of necessity laid over until next week.*SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.1*

In our reference to Henry VIII., last week, we stated that he cut off the heads of three wives. This is a mistake, he cut off the heads of only *two*-Anne Boleyn and Catherine Howard. Wicked murderer and libertine as he was, we would not lay more to his charge than rightly belongs there.*SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.2*

For several days passed a fair has been in progress in a Catholic Church which has recently been erected in Oakland, the object being to raise money to pay off the indebtedness. The following announcement which was made in one of the Oakland dailies, shows that the Catholic Church will not consent to being outdone by Protestants, in the way of "reaching the masses":-*SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.3*

"A large attendance is expected at St. Francis the Sales fair to-night, and there will be several fresh attractions. The shooting gallery must do well if it plans its own against some of the crack shots to ring the bell and pocket a good cigar every time. The refreshment department might make the staff of the first-class hotel turn green with envy, so varied an excellent is the bill of fare."*SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.4*

In a supplemental report of the North Pacific camp-meeting, we learned the following additional particulars. The Sabbath-school, conducted by Professor Granger, numbered four hundred thirty members. Last year there were but two hundred sixty. The class contributions for the day amounted to \$47.53. Children's meetings were conducted daily by Sister Morrison. In this work the Lord especially blessed, and many of the children were converted. Special pains were taken to instruct the children in the simple principles of the Gospel, and those who accepted Christ did so understandably. Of the thirty-one who were baptized, the majority were children and youth.*SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.5*

A Baptist paper (the *Flag*, of St. Louis, in animadverting recently upon certain remarks of the *Midland* (United Presbyterian), relative to the practice of infant communion, prevalent in the third century and for some time thereafter, says:-*SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.6*

"If Protestant churches receive infant baptism by tradition, why not receive the infant communion, which rests upon the same foundation? However, it would be much better to reject the whole batch of the traditions of men, and follow the example of Christ and the apostles."*SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.7*

These Protestant churches which "receive infant baptism by tradition" might turn this upon their Baptist critic, by asking, If Protestant churches receive Sunday-keeping by tradition, why not receive infant baptism, which rests upon the same foundation? And no one can give any good reason for receiving the one rather than the other. "It would," indeed, "be much better to reject the whole batch of the traditions of men, and follow the example of Christ and the apostles," which gives no more warrant for regarding Sunday as the Sabbath, than it does for baptizing infants or giving them the communion.*SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.8*

In our report of the Kansas camp-meeting, in another column, we stated that Elder Kilgore was called by telegraph to the capital of Illinois on account of the Sunday law bill which was to be made the special order for Tuesday, May 21, in both houses of the Legislature. Since writing that we have received a note from Brother Kilgore in which he says:-*SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.9*

"I arrived here on Tuesday morning, but the bill did not come up till Wednesday morning. A motion was made to call it back to the second reading but it was defeated by a large majority, and it then passed sweeping through the House by a vote of eighty to forty with cheers. There was more interest shown in it than I had seen in connection with any bill before the house prior to this one, or since it passed. It was then taken up in

the Senate and at once placed on the order of the second reading; and now it is still subject to an amendment. We have several senators pledged to us that they will do all they can to support a saving clause in our behalf. But I have learned by the experience of yesterday, that it is vain to trust in the arm of flesh." *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.10*

We hope to be able soon to lay before our readers a copy of the proposed Illinois Sunday law, so that they may see what a gentle(?) spirit actuates the Chicago preachers. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.11*

A few nights ago a meeting was held in Oakland, to express sympathy with Ireland. One of the speakers was Father McNally, who in his speech made the following inquiry: - *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.12*

"When did the Irish people, who have made up for centuries the Irish society, transfer their government to the English tyrant? Where are the deeds of transfer." *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.13*

Of course the *Irish people* never transferred their government to the English. But *the Pope* did. He not only transferred the government, but the people and the whole island itself. And if Father McNally, or anybody else, will call at this office we will show him the deed of transfer, in the original Latin. Why don't Father McNally and his compatriots and fellow sympathizers with Ireland call upon the Pope to give back to Ireland that which he gave away? Is England to blame for keeping what the Pope gave her to keep? *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.14*

The papers announce that "the Pope grants unprecedented honors to Queen Victoria." It is very kind indeed in the dear good Pope to condescend to "grant" honors, unprecedented or otherwise to the queen of Great Britain. The unprecedented honor in this case is that the Pope has "entirely of his own accord, and without any hint from Cardinal Manning, based a rescript which ordains that on Jubilee day, June 21, high mass and a Te Deus shall be performed in all Roman Catholic Churches in England." It is said that "his holiness could not have done more in the case of the most faithful Catholic sovereign." And then it is suggested, very innocently of course, that "the English clergy might return the compliment on the occasion of his holiness's approaching jubilee." Yes, they might, nor should we be much surprised if they do so. Of course some such thing as that is just what the Pope is fishing for, if only if it should be so at the official direction of the queen, such a recognition on the part of England would be of great weight in the longed-for universal recognition of the Papal sovereignty. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.15*

"Sunday Labor and Morality" The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

The rector of Trinity Church in San Francisco, Rev. Dr. H. W. Beers, was recently called as a witness in a case being tried in Oakland. The Doctor had testified that the defendant in the suit was a man of good moral character. On cross-examination he was asked if his opinion would have been different if he had known that the defendant attended baseball games on Sunday. His reply was, "I know very decent people who attend baseball games on Sunday." To the lawyer's question, "If Mr.—attended a baseball game instead of going to church, would it not affect is moral character in your opinion?" the reverend gentleman replied, "It would not affect my estimate of his moral character." *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.16*

Well, why should it? Moral character is determined by moral or immoral acts. An immoral act is one that is contrary to the moral law; and since Sunday observance is not required by the moral law, it follows that an act performed on Sunday cannot affect one's moral character, unless the act itself would be an immoral act if performed on Monday or Thursday, or any other day of the week. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.17*

In saying this, we do not mean to be understood that the time when a certain act is performed has nothing to do with the morality or immorality of the deed. Far from it. There is a day which God has declared holy, and whose observance is enjoined by the moral law. The fourth commandment gives us six days of the week in which to do all *our* work, but commands us to rest from our labor on the seventh day of the week. Now since morality is nothing else but conformity to the moral law, it follows that it would be immoral to do things upon the seventh day, which might be perfectly legitimate on any other day. But aside from the nature of the act itself, no immorality can attach to any deed performed on Sunday. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.18*

"A Good Description" The Signs of the Times, 13, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

The International Sunday-school lesson for June 12 is on the first four commandments, and it is interesting to note the different reasons which different lesson commentators give for keeping the first day of the week instead of the seventh day, as enjoined by the fourth commandment. Dr. Alexander McLaren, of Manchester, England, has an article in the *Sunday School Times*, in which he says: - *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.19*

"We have not the Jewish Sabbath nor is it binding on us. But as men we ought to rest, and resting, to worship on one day of the week. The unwritten law of Christianity moulding all outward forms by its own free spirit, gradually, and without premeditation, slid from the seventh to the first day, as it had clear right to do." *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.20*

This is about the best statement of the case that we have yet seen. It is a truth that "we have not the Jewish Sabbath" and that it is not binding upon us, because the fourth commandment knows nothing of any such Sabbath. The Sabbath which we have, and which the fourth commandment enjoins upon us, is the Sabbath of the Lord, which is the seventh day of the week. But what we wish to call especial attention to is the aptness with which the writer describes the change from the seventh day to the first. The law of God did not change, but "the unwritten law of Christianity," which is another term for the natural inclinations of professed Christians, "gradually, and without premeditation, *did* from the seventh to the first day." *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.21*

That's just it; that sentence describes the case as well as a whole volume could. There was no commandment for the change, but the people gradually *slid* over onto the first day of the week. In so doing, they clearly slid away from the commandment, which they had no right to do. If they had heeded the commandment, as they ought to have done, they would not have slid; for Inspiration describes the righteous man thus, "The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide." *Psalms 37:31*. When men let go of the commandments of God, they are sure to slide. *SITI June 9, 1887, page 352.22*

June 16, 1887

"Born of God" The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

There are few texts that have been the subject of more anxious inquiry than *1 John 3:9*: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." This is made much of by the self-styled "holiness" people, who use it to bolster up their own claims to perfection. They seem to take it for granted that they are specially referred to in the text, and think that all one has to do to be beyond the reach of sin is to profess to be born again. On the other hand, there are some who think that such a condition as the text describes is impossible in this life, and that it refers to the life to come, claiming that the new birth is at the resurrection. A question having been asked as to the meaning of the text, we take space for a brief exposition of it. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 353.1*

In the first place we would say that being "born of God" is a change that takes place in this life, and not at the resurrection. John says in this same chapter (*verses 1, 2*): "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. Beloved, *now* are we the sons of God." Men are not by nature children of God. Paul says that the "children of disobedience," who walk according to the lusts of the flesh, "fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind," are "by nature the children of wrath." *Ephesians 2:2, 3*. To the unbelieving Jews, who sought to murder Christ because he reproved their wicked deeds, the Saviour said, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." *John 8:44*. Now since "all have sinned" and are consequently by nature the "children of wrath," children of the devil, it follows that those who are now the sons of God have become so by the new birth. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 353.2*

Again, being born again is a prerequisite to obtaining the life to come. Jesus said to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born again, ye cannot see the kingdom of God." *John 3:3*. And he repeated the statement in these words: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Verse 5. These texts not only show that the new birth takes place before the resurrection, but they also set us on the track of what the new birth is. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 353.3*

We learn that in the new birth both water and the Spirit have a part. This reminds us of what Paul says in *Romans 8:11-14*: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." The possession of the Spirit shows that we are sons of God, and that we are Christ's. *Romans 8:9*. It is called "the Spirit of adoption." *SITI June 16, 1887, page 353.4*

The first work of the Spirit upon the hearts of men, is to "reprove the world of sin." *John 16:8*. Conviction of sin, if not stifled, will necessarily drive the soul to Christ (see *Romans 7:24, 25; 8:1*); and Paul says that "if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." *2 Corinthians 5:17*. But if a man in Christ is a *new creature*, it must be that he has had a new birth; therefore we know that one who is born of God is one who is in Christ. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 353.5*

Now read *Romans 6:1-3*: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" And also *Galatians 3:26, 27*: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Here we learn, what has already been stated, that sons of God are they who are in Christ; and we learn also that we put on Christ, or are ushered into Christ, by baptism. Now connect with these texts *1 Corinthians 12:12, 13*, where baptism and the Spirit are coupled together, as in *John 3:5*. It reads: "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." *SITI June 16, 1887, page 353.6*

Thus the Spirit convicts of sin; the convicted sinner repents and flies to Christ for cleansing from sin; he shows his acceptance of Christ by being baptized, and rises to walk in newness of life, a new creature in Christ, if he abides in Christ. This is the new birth, or, as it is commonly called, conversion. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 353.7*

But what has this to do with the statement in *1 John 3:9* that whosoever is born of God sinneth not? We shall see, when we have examined one or two texts more which relate to the new birth. We have already seen that the Spirit of God is the prime factor in effecting the new birth. It first works upon the heart, to convict of sin. But how does the Spirit convict of sin? Through what does it operate? In *Ephesians 6:17* we are told that the sword of the Spirit is the word of God. Then since the word of God is the Spirit's sword, it must be by means

of the word that the Spirit convicts of sin. In support of this conclusion we read *Hebrews 4:12, 13*: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." *SITI June 16, 1887, page 353.8*

Then the word of God, -and by this the law is specially referred to, -has much to do in the work of conversion, or the new birth. Without it, the Spirit could make no impression on the heart; and so the psalmist ascribes to it a leading place in the work of conversion, saying, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." *Psalm 19:7*. Now we are prepared for a text which will bring us right back to the one with which we started. We quote *1 Peter 1:22, 23*: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently; being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." *SITI June 16, 1887, page 353.9*

In these texts last quoted we find the word of God brought to view as the seed by which men are begotten sons of God. Now read once more the text which we are studying: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." Why does not such an one commit sin? Because the seed by which he was begotten remains in him. And what is that seed? The word of God and the Spirit of God. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 353.10*

That the possession of the word of God in the heart is a guard against sin, is shown by the psalmist, who, speaking of the righteous man, says: "The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide." *Psalm 37:31*. And again he says: "Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee." *Psalm 119:11*. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 354.1*

This statement about the law of God being in a man's heart, reminds us of what the Lord Jesus said, through the psalmist, of himself: "Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." *Psalm 40:7, 8*. Now since David says that the law in the heart keeps a man's feet from slipping, we will examine a notable instance in the life of our Saviour, to see how it works. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 354.2*

After Jesus was baptized, he was led into the wilderness to be tempted. After he had fasted forty days and forty nights, the devil said to him: "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." *Matthew 4:3*. How did Jesus meet this temptation? Not with parleying, but with the words, "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." That settled the question once for all. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 354.3*

Then the devil took Jesus up and placed him on a pinnacle of the temple, and said, "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down." Again the prompt reply came: "It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Here again, from the fullness of the word which was hidden in his heart, Jesus drew a weapon which foiled this attack of the enemy. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 354.4*

Once more the devil plied his temptation. Taking Jesus into a high mountain, he showed him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, promising them all to him if he would but for one moment worship Satan as God. Quick as thought came the words from the lips of Jesus, "Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." *SITI June 16, 1887, page 354.5*

Notice that Jesus met every temptation with a text of Scripture. But these temptations were suffered and recorded for our benefit, that we might learn how to resist. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 354.6*

Again: Faith is said to be the Christian's shield. *Ephesians 6:16*: "Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked." But faith cannot be separated from the word, for "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." *Romans 10:17*. One's faith is just equal to the amount of the word that he has not committed to memory, simply-but hidden in the heart. Now we can understand *1 John 5:18*: "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked on toucheth him not." The object of a shield is to protect the person from fling missiles. In ancient times, when men fought with swords and bows, the man who received all the blows on his shield kept himself, so that he was not touched. So in the Christian warfare, the one who receives the assaults of Satan upon the shield of that faith which is the outgrowth of God's own word, will keep himself untouched. Thus it was that Christ came off unscathed in his contest with Satan. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 354.7*

Once more: In *John 15:7* we read: "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." That is a comprehensive promise. "Ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." What will be the constant request of the one who abides in Christ? It will evidently be for more

of a likeness to him. David expressed it when he said: "One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after; that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple." *Psalm 27:4*. Dare anyone say that such desires will not be gratified. They must be because Jesus said: "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." *Matthew 5:6*. Not filled with a good, happy feeling; not filled with complacency; not filled with self-conceit; but filled with righteousness-right doing-obedience to God's commandments; as righteousness is inseparably connected with meekness. *Zephaniah 2:3; Psalm 25:9.SITI June 16, 1887, page 354.8*

From this brief study it will be seen that 1 *John 3:9* does call for perfect obedience. So does the whole Bible. That book makes no provision for a little sin to be retained. Christ died that he might present to himself, that is, find when he comes for it, "a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." *Ephesians 5:27*. This is the requirement. And surely if one abides in Christ, and if the word of truth by which he was turned from sin, still remains in him, it will continue to have the same effect that it had at first, and will keep him from sin. This does not mean that the individual will necessarily be perfect in knowledge, nor that he will be in a position where there is nothing more to gain; but it does mean that so far as he has knowledge of the law of God he will walk in it. He will be one of the "undefiled in the way." *Psalm 119:1.SITI June 16, 1887, page 354.9*

Such an one will never boast of his goodness. He will be too much occupied in keeping from falling, to boast, and how will he keep from falling? "Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith." The more he beholds Christ, the more will he feel his own nothingness in comparison; this will beget humility; humility will beget trustfulness; and trustfulness will bring strength. Thus he will be "strong in the Lord and in the power of his might," and, going on from strength to strength, will at last appear in Zion before God. W.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 354.10*

"What Is the Resurrection?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

In answer to a question upon the resurrection, the *Christian Union* says: "Resurrection, or 'rising up' (as the word means) is the entrance of the spirit into the embodied life of the world to come." This is Spiritualist doctrine, but it is held by very many who profess to be orthodox. There seems to be a sort of fascination about it, although we cannot conceive wherein the fascination consists, unless it is in the fact that the doctrine contradicts the Bible. Let the reader who is inclined to accept the *Christian Union's* definition of the resurrection, but who has a regard for the Bible, notice the following scriptures:-*SITI June 16, 1887, page 358.1*

1. *Matthew 20:17-19*: "And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart in the way, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, And shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him; and the third day he shall rise again." Paul also says that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures." 1 *Corinthians 15:3, 4*. And he also states that this was "the resurrection from the dead." *Romans 1:4*. The Spiritualist theory says that the resurrection is the rising of the soul from the body, at death; the Bible says that the resurrection of Christ was not till three days after his crucifixion. Which is more worthy of belief?*SITI June 16, 1887, page 358.2*

2. *Matthew 27:62-64*: "Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulcher be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead." Notice the direct contrast between the Spiritualist theory of the resurrection and the Bible teaching. According to the Spiritualist theory, the resurrection of Jesus took place as soon as he breathed his last breath upon the cross. But here we find that the next day after the crucifixion the Jews desired a guard so that the disciples might not steal his body away and so claim that he had been raised from the dead according to his prediction. From this we learn that when Jesus, his disciples, and the Pharisees spoke of the resurrection from the dead, they all had the idea but that some time after death the body should be restored to life. And the Bible nowhere recognizes anything as resurrection, except restoration of the body to life. Just imagine the Pharisees asking for a guard to prevent the spirit of Christ from leaving the body! The Spiritualist theory makes nonsense of the Bible.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 358.3*

3. *John 6:40*: "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." These are the words of Christ. The Spiritualist teaching is that everyone is raised at what is called death; Christ says that believers shall be raised at the last day. No "advanced thinker" would be so wild as to claim that the spirit does not leave the body of

any man until the last day, yet Christ says that that is when the resurrection will take place. And lest some should claim that the "last day" refers to the last day of a man's earthly life, we quote the words of Christ in *John 5:28, 29*: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." This shows that the resurrection is a coming forth from the grave.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 358.4*

4. 1 *Corinthians 15:51-54*: "Behold, I show you a mystery; We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." No comment could make it plainer that the resurrection takes place at the last trump, and that it consists in the raising of the body to life.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 358.5*

We might cite additional texts by the score, showing the same thing. Shall we not believe the Bible doctrine of the resurrection, rather than the Spiritualist theory? Reason alone would say that we ought, since it is the Bible alone that reveals the fact that there will be a resurrection. And does it not seem strange the Spiritualists, and those who follow their teaching without taking their name, will prate loftily about the resurrection from the dead, while all the time they deny that there is any such thing as death? Surely "the legs of the lame are not equal," and all who depart from the simplicity of Bible doctrine are deplorably lame. W.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 358.6*

"What Absurd Thing Shall Come Next?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

We had often head of the mind-cure theory, but now we see it. We always thought it was a mess of nonsense, but now we know that such only it is. We have before us the "formula" by which prescriptions are to be compounded for the cure of all diseases that humanity is heir to. What? "humanity" did we say? Oh, no, there is no humanity! It is all divinity. And "diseases" did we say? It is all a mistake. There is no such thing as disease, nor ache, nor pain-all this is a hoax. You get your finger caught as in a vice; it is not pinched, it does not hurt-it can't hurt, for don't you know that "matter has no life, and is insensible to pain or pleasure?" You only believe it hurts, and that is all. In fact matter "has no real existence" anyhow, and how can anything be really affected that has no real existence? "Matter is only an appearance like an image in a mirror;" and do you suppose that your reflection in a mirror could have its hand cut with a buzz-saw, or its finger mashed with a hammer? Do you suppose its tooth or head ever aches? Does it ever have the dyspepsia or neuralgia? Why, of course not. Well, then, are you so lost to all true ideas of sense or perception as not to know that "you are not material," and that that about you which appears to be matter "is only an appearance like an image in a mirror"? And are you so dull as to suppose that an appearance can ache, or swell, or be inflamed, or be sick? If you are, you must get bravely over all that, for "pain and sickness exist only as beliefs, and come from consulting the appearance instead of clinging to the reality?"*SITI June 16, 1887, page 360.1*

Gentle reader, do you wonder whether we are not just "making this up"? Do you wonder whether there is anybody in this wide world who would put forth in sober earnest, and apparently with the expectation of being believed, such utter senselessness? If you do then you may safely lay aside all wonderment, for such is the case, and it is all sober fact. Let us proceed:-*SITI June 16, 1887, page 360.2*

"The belief you have entertained of neuralgia, constipation, hoarseness, etc., is a profound error from beginning to end."*SITI June 16, 1887, page 360.3*

We know better, for we have had them all-not all at once, but one or two at a time-and instead of it being only a belief that we had them, it was a painful reality.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 360.4*

"You are a spirit... you cannot commit sin, be sick, or die."*SITI June 16, 1887, page 360.5*

Wrong altogether. We are not spirit, we are flesh, subject to all the laws of flesh. We *can* commit sin, and are afraid we shall (especially if we read much more of this stuff), and we often have, and are sorry for it. We *can* be sick, and must be very careful that we be not, as thousands of people are. We *can* die, as everybody, except two persons, has died that ever has lived in this world, and multitudes are dying daily, and as multitudes shall die.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 360.6*

"You are perfectly well [yes, we are], ever have been [no, we have not], ever will be." Thank you for the conclusion; hope we may be, yet we doubt it much.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 360.7*

"Jesus conquered all these beliefs in false seemings [that is, false, for he died], and was lifted up into a perfect person of the spiritual truth of being, and he said that if he was lifted up, he would draw all men unto him. Therefore, because he did reveal this Christ-life of spiritual truth to man, you have only to follow that thought of his in your thoughts to come, yourself realizing that you are perfectly well and cannot suffer from any inflamed nerves, or irritated vocal organs or bronchial tubes, which you call neuralgia and hoarseness; it is an illusion." *SITI June 16, 1887, page 361.1*

There, that is all we need to quote; there is much more to the same purpose, but this is enough. We can only say that if anything could possibly be more of "an illusion" than this theory of the mind-cure, we should like to know how any conception of it could be conveyed to the human mind. And when we realize that there are men and women who actually believe in such unmitigated nonsense as is set forth in this "formula," we confess that our confidence in human nature is just about in the last stages of dissolution, for after that what is there, or what can there be, that men may not believe. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 361.2*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

In these days when so many people are claiming that the Sabbath law is abolished, we are glad to find some who will testify to the perpetuity of the Sabbath commandment even though they do not observe it. Thus the *Interior* of June 2 says concerning the fourth commandment:-*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.1*

"Observe (1) this Sabbath law is as old as Creation being found founded on the fact that God rested after he completed his creative work. (2) It will never cease to be binding on man. Christ did not abrogate it anymore than he abrogated the commandment, 'Thou shalt not kill,' or any other precept of the moral law." *SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.2*

E. C. G. having read the articles on the millennium lately printed in the SIGNS, asks the following questions on *Revelation 20:9*:-*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.3*

"How can the wicked compass the camp of the saints about unless it is upon the earth? Does the beloved city come down from Heaven before the wicked are destroyed?" *SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.4*

The wicked cannot at all compass the camp of the saints about unless it is on the earth. And the text itself shows that it will be on the earth when they do compass it about. "They went up *on the breadth of the earth*, and compassed the camp of the saints about, *and the beloved city*." And as they compass "the beloved city" before they are destroyed, that of itself proves that the beloved city must have come down from Heaven before they are destroyed. This is at the close of the thousand years. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.5*

We often hear people refuse to make pledges of means for the support of some missionary enterprise, on the ground that they don't think it right to make a pledge. They always say that they intend to give something, though whether they do give or not is a question. The following from an English paper would seem to indicate that giving is a habit, and that those who have not the habit give nothing, while those who have the habit give to every worthy object:-*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.6*

"No fewer than thirty-one people of position in England declined to subscribe to the Church House on the ground that they wished to give their money to the fund for the poor clergy; yet it was found a day or two ago, on examining the list, that not one of them had sent a donation to the latter fund. On the other hand, fifty-seven subscribers to the Church House, whose contributions amounted to over 2,450, appeared as donors to the poor clergy fund of no less a sum than £3,630." *SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.7*

The Vienna correspondent of the *London Times* is the authority for the statement that a second edition of 120,000 copies of Rev. Isaac Salkinson's Hebrew translation of the New Testament has been published. Of this number 100,000 copies have been bought by one man for gratuitous distribution among Hebrew-reading Jews all over Europe. *SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.8*

"Making the Sabbath a Holy Day" The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

In one of the religious weeklies we find the following, which is part of a comment on the fourth commandment:-*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.9*

"On the seventh day our bodies and minds must rest; and our souls also. Our spiritual nature must hold communion with Heaven, thus making the Sabbath a holy day." *SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.10*

The thought here expressed is altogether too common. It is a grave mistake to suppose that we have anything to do with the degree of holiness of the Sabbath-day. No man can make a day holy, no matter how holy or how absorbed in spiritual contemplation he may be. If all the Christian people in the world should agree to set apart Wednesday for rest and religious meditation, and worship, that day would not be any more sacred than it is now. The seventh day is a holy day because God made it holy; he "hallowed it." He alone could do this. It matters not if everyone in the world devoted the day to secular work and pleasure, the day would be just as holy as it was when God hallowed it. But the people themselves cannot be holy. This is the point: The action of people in regard to sacred things makes no difference with those things, but with the people themselves. By constantly reverencing holy things, men become holy; by disregarding holy things they injure themselves, but do not detract from the holiness of the sacred thing. Men cannot make God's name any the less sacred by blaspheming it; neither could they make the name of Baal holy by reverencing it. So men cannot make the seventh day any less holy by devoting it to secular uses; and all the "*consensus* of Christian thought" that there is in the world, cannot attach a single iota of sacredness to Sunday.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.11*

"Humility Wanted" The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

Simulated Christianity is often so nearly like the genuine that it cannot be detected upon a short acquaintance, and yet there is generally something about it that arouses a suspicion that it is not just what it should be. A meek and quiet spirit must characterize every true Christian, and it matters not how loud the profession nor how great the manifestation of feeling, if humility dwells not in the heart, "this man's religion is vain."*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.12*

In view of the maximum of profession, and the minimum of possession, in religious circles to-day, the following truths incidentally expressed in a recent number of the New York *Christian Advocate* are to the point. Speaking of "*De Imitations Christi*" a book written nearly five hundred years ago, probably by Thomas a Kempis, the *Advocate* says:-*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.13*

"The restless activity of this age needs the calmness of the "*Imitatione*," and its call to stop and think and look within. The superficial views prevalent as to sin, and the easy-going sort of piety which flourishes, nowadays, need the earnest and penetrating teachings of this little book. And for the cant, narrowness, and pharisaic self-righteousness of much of the present so-called holiness literature-especially that circulated among Methodists-there needs to be substituted the sincerity, freshness, humility, and depth of spiritual insight, which constitute some of the chief charms of the "*Imitatione*," and which have attracted to it devout minds of all communions."*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.14*

"Scripture Verified" The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

Every new discovery by those who are busily engaged in the work of unearthing the monuments and records of antiquity, serves to make more evident the simple, straightforward truth of the Scripture narrative. The statement in *Exodus 1:8*, that "there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph," is one that commentators have thought it necessary to almost apologize for. They have given learned explanations, showing in what figurative sense the words were to be taken. But now the mummy of that "new king" has been discovered, and visitors to the Bulaq Museum may gaze upon the features of that mighty tyrant who lived over three thousand years ago. We have not space to tell all the circumstances of the finding (they are given in the *May Century*), but it is sufficient to say that it is quite conclusively demonstrated that this king was not of Egyptian stock at all, but of Assyrian. He was the second of a new dynasty, but as his father reigned but a very few years, and did nothing of note, he was practically the first.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.15*

This fact shows the appropriateness of the expression, "there arose a *new king*," and the reader can readily see how a foreign usurper would not know Joseph, and would care nothing for the kindred of one who had done so much for Egypt. He owed the Israelites no debt of gratitude, and saw in them only a people whom he could use to advance the glory of his reign, and who, if left to themselves, might prove formidable adversaries.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.16*

And this also throws light upon another text. In *Isaiah 52:4* we read: "For thus saith the Lord God, My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there; and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause." This verse has been supposed to refer to two distinct independent events, but the discovery shows that it is the statement of simple fact.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.17*

This is only one of hundreds of instances where the correctness of Bible history has been demonstrated by discoveries of ancient records, and should serve to teach people that they need not get scared and begin to

reject or apologize for the Scriptures when they find statements that they cannot understand.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.18*

“Celibacy of the Clergy” The Signs of the Times, 13, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

L. A. T. asks if it can be proved that the Simon spoken of in *Luke 4:38* is Simon Peter, the one whom the Catholics claim was the first Pope, and thinks that if it can be so proved, it will be very much against the Papal dogma that the clergy should not marry. We reply that the Simon of *Luke 4:38* is none other than Simon Peter, as may be seen by reading *Matthew 8:14, 15*, where we find the same thing that is recorded in Luke. But this does not affect the Papal doctrine of the celibacy of the clergy. The Catholic Church does not profess to derive that point from the Bible, and consequently nothing that can be drawn from the Bible will have any weight with them. They are very well aware that Peter was married. In fact, it is not probable that there was one of the apostles who was not a married man; and Paul, in giving the qualifications of a bishop, says that he “must be blameless, the husband of one wife.”*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.19*

In the early history of the church, no such thing as the celibacy of the clergy was known. In the third century it began to be taught that a clergyman should not marry the second time. This was from a false conception of *1 Timothy 3:2*. In the fourth century, as the “mystery of iniquity” was approaching its full development as the “man of sin,” decrees began to be issued forbidding the clergy to marry. For several centuries there was controversy over this subject, and perhaps the majority of Catholic priests were married, although councils were declaring against them. It was not till the pontificate of Gregory VII., A.D. 1073-1085, that the celibacy of the clergy was fully established in the Catholic Church, that Pope being the first who had the determination and the power to enforce his decrees. Those priests who were married were obliged to put away their wives. Many scandals ensued, and at the time of the Reformation these were so common among the clergy as to scarcely excite remark. There can be no doubt that while celibacy has been a fruitful source of the abominations of the Papacy, it has added to its power, since the priests, having no family ties, may be sent at a moment’s notice wherever their superiors indicate.*SITI June 16, 1887, page 363.20*

June 23, 1887

"Effects of Erroneous Opinions" The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

It is very common for those who are quite loose in their belief, or who do not believe much of anything, to ease their consciences by saying, "God will never condemn a man on account of his opinions; it is how a man lives that determines his condition at last." How these people acquired such intimate knowledge of God's plans, so as to be able to speak so definitely of what he will or will not do, is not apparent; for it is very evident from the Bible that a man's opinions have a good deal to do in deciding his final destiny. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.1*

It seems never to occur to those who use the expression quoted above, that they are strangely inconsistent with themselves. The very ones who use such language will speak very slightly of one who "has not the courage of his convictions," that is, one who holds opinions which he dare not act out. Such a man they justly accuse of leading a double life; and yet they seem to think that God will be perfectly satisfied with a man who leads such a life. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.2*

But the great mistake is in supposing that a man can hold opinions which will not to a greater or less extent influence his actions. The statement by Watts, that "the mind's the standard of the man," is but another way of expressing the truth uttered by Solomon, that as a man "thinketh in his heart, so is he." A man cannot entertain vile thoughts and still have all his actions pure. Neither can a man entertain erroneous opinions without acting in accordance with them, unless his circumstances hinder him; and in that case he is entitled to no more credit than the thief in prison is to be commended for not stealing. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.3*

In times past people have suffered severely on account of their opinions. When Paul says, "By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace," he says in effect that the inhabitants of Jericho perished because they believed not. If they had believed, they might have been saved as well as the harlot Rahab. But they were of the opinion that their gods were stronger than the God of Israel. Somebody might have said to them, "It doesn't make any difference what ideas you have about God; it is your actions that will determine your final lot." But their ideas of God had everything to do in shaping their actions and their erroneous ideas led them into practices which caused their ruin. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.4*

Again, we read of the children of Israel: "For some, when they had heard, did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he [Christ] grieved forty years? was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcases fell in the wilderness? And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see that they could not enter in because of unbelief." *Hebrews 3:16-19*. Here we have the plain declaration that it was the unbelief of the Israelites that shut them out of the promised land. "They could not enter in because of unbelief." But would they not have been allowed to enter in if they had not sinned? Certainly; and they would not have sinned but for their unbelief. Their sin was a necessary consequence of their unbelief. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.5*

How was it with the inhabitants of Sodom? When Lot, who believed the warnings of the angels, went out to tell his relatives that God was going to destroy the city, "he seemed as one that mocked." They regarded him as a fanatic; very likely they thought he was losing his mind, and would have to be cared for. But the Lord did destroy the city, and all those who disbelieved perished with it. It was their opinion that they were safe enough, and in consequence of their erroneous opinion they perished. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.6*

We may learn a lesson from them. Indeed their case is recorded for our admonition. Christ says: "Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed." *Luke 17:28-30*. All over the land the coming of the Lord is being proclaimed. The same word of prophecy foretells that his coming is now very near. Yet these things are to thousands as idle tales. Those who preach the nearness of the second advent are regarded as fanatical. It is the common opinion that the world is just in its infancy. Men say, "Well, it doesn't make any difference how we believe in regard to the coming of the Lord, if we only live right." But still the truth exists that only "unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." *Hebrews 9:28*. Why will this be so? Simply because those who do not believe that his coming is near at hand, will not be getting ready for it. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.7*

Let no one delude himself with the idea that he has "a right to his own opinions," and that he can believe what he pleases and still be safe at last. It is true that so far as other men are concerned, he has a right to his own opinions; that is, he is not answerable to any man for what he believes; but all men are answerable to God for

their opinions. No man has a right to hold an opinion contrary to what God has revealed in his word. And those who shall cling to their self-assumed right to believe what they please, will find at the last that it was a dearly-bought privilege. Among those who "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death," the *unbelieving* occupy a prominent place. "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God." *W.SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.8*

"The New Law" The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

An exchange says: "Many persons seem to think that because the ten commands were done away, we have no moral precepts to guide us. I will, therefore, in a few words, show that nine of the commands-all the moral part-are adopted or re-enacted in the new law (New Testament) which is now our authority in place of the old law that it supercedes and annuls." There are many people who entertain, just such ideas as are expressed in this quotation, and therefore before we examine that which the writer gives as a substitute for the decalogue, we wish to show how erroneous such assumptions are. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.9*

(a) It is assumed that the ten commandments were done away. But this is in direct contradiction of what the Scriptures say of God's purpose concerning the law, and of its nature. First read a few statements: "Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever." *Psalms 119:152*. "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." *Verse 100*. "The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand [margin, "are established"] fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." *Psalms 111:7, 8*. Again, our Saviour said: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." *Luke 16:17*. If it is asked how this can be, the briefest examination of the nature of the law will give the answer. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.10*

(b) The law of God is the righteousness of God. This is indicated in Isaiah's prophecy: "The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honorable." But *Isaiah 51:6, 7* shows beyond all question that the law is God's righteousness. We read: "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished. Harken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law." The people who know righteousness are they in whose heart is the law of God; the obvious meaning is that they know righteousness because the law is in their heart; and this will be made still more evident further on. The righteousness which is known by the law of God is God's righteousness; and when that truth is grasped, we scarcely need to be told that it will not be abolished, for that would be to tear God from his throne. Now we can understand how it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than for a particle of the law to fail. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.11*

(c) The law of God is his will. Paul says: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law." *Romans 2:17, 18*. This is perfectly in harmony with the statement that the law is God's righteousness, for God is righteous, and his will must be righteous. That the ten commandments are referred to by "the law" is evident from *verses 21-23*. Now since the ten commandments are the righteousness of God, and his will, it necessarily follows that they *cannot* be abolished. Be it understood that when "the law" is mentioned, there is no discrimination, but the whole law is referred to. David had reference to the whole law when he said: "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Now if a part of the law were abolished, it would be no more perfect. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.12*

But it is useless to speak about the possibility or probability of the abolition of any part of the law; for it would be impossible to abolish any portion of it. God himself could not abolish any portion of it; for that would be to abolish his own goodness, and "he cannot deny himself." So long as God's throne is in Heaven, and his kingdom rules over all, so long must the ten commandments, the law of his kingdom, remain intact. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.13*

2. It is assumed that only nine of the ten commandments were moral, and that the fourth was not. But this assumption is itself fatal to the assumption that the ten commandments were done away; for a moral law cannot be done away. Moral duties grow out of the nature of God, and they can not be done away so long as God is God. He who admits that nine of the ten commandments are moral thereby admits that they cannot be abolished. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.14*

Let us make this point a little more clear. If a law is abolished, then the duty which it once enjoined is no longer a duty, and that which it forbade is no longer a crime. Now take the seventh commandment. If that

were ever abolished, even though it were afterward re-enacted, there must have been a time when it was not an immoral act to commit adultery! So also of the eighth commandment: if that were abolished, then it was not wrong to steal. But no right-minded person can conceive of a time when it would be right to kill, steal, or commit adultery. Now if it could never be right for all people to live promiscuously, as to persons and property, or for human life to be considered as of no value, or for God's name to be held in no repute, then it follows that the commandments which forbid such things must always be in force. It is impossible for anyone who has any just conception of morality to imagine such a thing as a moral law being abolished. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.15*

Having seen that moral commandments cannot be abolished, let us consider the fourth commandment in particular. It is claimed that it is not moral. Did it ever occur to anyone to wonder why God should insert a non-moral commandment in the midst of moral precepts? It would be much easier to answer the statement that it is not moral, if those who say so would tell us what is necessary to constitute a moral precept. "Moral" is defined as "relating to duty or obligation." Well, the Sabbath commandment was given by the Creator of the universe, and certainly it is man's duty to obey. We cannot conceive of anything that could have more effect in making a commandment moral than that it came from God, for he is the source of all morality. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 374.16*

As with the other commandments, so with the fourth; we cannot conceive of a time when to violate it would not be sin. The Sabbath commandment is the first of which we have the record of its being given to man. In Eden at the close of creation it was sanctified. It "was made for man." It was based on the unalterable facts of creation (*Genesis 2:2, 3*); so that the only way it could be abolished would be to abolish the fact that the earth was created, which is of course impossible. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.1*

It is sometimes claimed that the fourth commandment is not like the others, because, while they are to be kept every moment of time, it requires a duty only once a week. Such have read the commandment to little purpose. The very first word, "remember," covers every moment of a man's life. Not only during the twenty-four hours of the Sabbath is the fourth commandment to be kept, but during all the hours of the week. The man who does not remember the Sabbath every working day, will not keep the Sabbath when it comes. The fourth commandment covers the six days of labor as well as the seventh day of rest; and when we consider that it alone of all the ten, names and specifies the giver of the law, we cannot fail to see that it is the very heart of the moral law. Take it away, and there would be nothing to point out the authority of the lawgiver. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.2*

We will now examine the new law, as given by our exchange. It is as follows:- *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.3*

1-One God; *Ephesians 4:6 and 1 Corinthians 8:6.* *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.4*

2-Idolatry forbidden; *1 Corinthians 6:9; 10:7-14, and 1 John 5:21.* *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.5*

3-Swearing forbidden; *James 5:12.* *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.6*

4-Sabbath; nowhere enjoined, either by precept or example. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.7*

5-Obedience to parents enjoined; *Ephesians 6:1-2, and Colossians 3:20.* *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.8*

6-Murder forbidden; *Romans 13:9; Galatians 5:21; 1 Peter 4:15; 1 John 3:15.* *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.9*

7-Adultery; *Romans 13:9; 1 Corinthians 6:9; Hebrews 13:4; James 4:4.* *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.10*

8-Steal not; *Romans 13:9; Ephesians 4:28.* *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.11*

9-False witness; *Romans 13:9.* *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.12*

10-Covetousness forbidden; *Romans 13:9; 1 Corinthians 6:10; Ephesians 5:5.* *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.13*

We have copied the above exactly and are not responsible for the reference to Romans 31 (corrected). The first "commandment" of this new law tells us that there is one God. Very well, we can *believe* that, but the mere statement that there is one God does not involve any duty. The devils themselves can and do keep such a commandment as that. See *James 2:19*. The fact is, the texts cited contain no semblance of a commandment, as anybody can see for himself. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.14*

Those scriptures which are referred to as containing the second commandment, refer simply to the first. The second commandment forbids bowing down to images, or the representation of God, by something in heaven or earth. Nothing to this effect is found in the New Testament. Without the Old Testament it would be utterly

impossible to convict the Catholic of sin when he makes obeisance to the image of the Virgin Mary or of Christ. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.15*

The sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth commandments, as given in the "new law," are simply quotations from the Decalogue given upon Sinai, and do not purport to be anything else. We are told that, just as the new constitution of California contains many things that were in the old one, so the new law contains many things that were in the decalogue of Sinai, and that therefore we must consider these commandments as part of the new law. But now that the new constitution of California is in force, men do not quote anything from the old one; whereas Paul is quoting directly from the ten commandments of Sinai, and is not giving a new law, nor quoting from some other law in the New Testament. Moreover he declares (*Romans 7:7*) that long before this was written, he was convicted of sin by the law which says, "Thou shalt not covet." *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.16*

As to the fourth commandment, we find it taught by the example of Christ and the apostles (*Luke 4:16; Acts 13:14; 17:2; 18:4*), and also by precept. *Matthew 24:20*. But this is not why the Sabbath should be kept. It should be kept because "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.17*

One more point should be noticed concerning this alleged new law. That is, that it is quoted from four different men, who wrote about thirty years after Christ. Allowing that they had a right to make laws, and that the scriptures quoted constitute the new law, we should have a period of about thirty years between the crucifixion, when it is alleged that the old law was done away, and the giving of the new law. Thirty years in which there was no moral law whatever! Thirty years in which it was not wrong to swear, kill, steal, lie, and commit adultery! To such lengths of absurdity will men go in their attempts to evade a plain but unpleasant duty. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.18*

But the simple fact is that Peter, James, John, and Paul had no more authority to enact or re-enact moral precepts than the Pope of Rome has. "There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy." *James 4:12*. Isaiah tells us who this "one lawgiver" is: "For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; he will save us." *Isaiah 33:22*. If any of the apostles had presumed to speak anything on their own authority, or to enact or re-enact any moral precept, they would have been acting the part of the "man of sin," "the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." To say that the apostles presumed to institute moral precepts, is to basely slander them. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.19*

From this examination of the matter, and if space allowed it might be made much more thorough, we find that if there is any moral obligation in the world at the present time, it is by virtue of the ten commandments. If they have been done away, then there is no such thing as morality or immorality; there can be no such thing as character. But they have not been abolished; they cannot be abolished; and therefore to fear God and keep his commandments still constitutes the whole duty of man. He who presumes to sit in judgment on the law, and to absolve himself from obedience to any part of it, will find to his sorrow that there is one Lawgiver who is able to destroy. *W. SITI June 23, 1887, page 375.20*

"Faith and Works" The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

A subscriber says: "Please harmonize *James 2:24, 25* with *verses 22* and *23* and *verses 17* and *18* of the same chapter." This is easily done, or, rather, there is no necessity for doing it, as they are already in harmony. The statement in each is practically the same. Beginning with *verse 15* we read: "If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works." *SITI June 23, 1887, page 376.1*

Verses 15 and *16* forcibly illustrate the truth that words, without corresponding deeds, amount to nothing. Professions of sympathy for the distressed are worthless, unless some practical sympathy is shown. A man may, for a short time, get the reputation of being charitable, simply because of his fervent professions of sympathy for the poor; but if he is never known to render them any assistance, people soon come to regard his professions of sympathy as false, and become disgusted with them. Just so it is with faith, says the apostle. A man may profess faith in Christ, but if no works are manifest, there is no faith there. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 376.2*

In the eighteenth verse he supposes a case. The man who has works may say to one who professes faith without works: Show me your faith without works, and I will show you faith by my works. But, according to *verse 17*, a man cannot exhibit faith without works; if he has no works, it is an evidence that he has no faith. But the fact that a man has good works is of itself evidence that he has faith, for good works are the invariable result of living faith. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 376.3*

This is shown by *verses 21-23*: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." Some have thought that this contradicts Paul's statement that a man is justified by faith only; but it does not. James explains how a man is justified by works, by the case of Abraham. His faith was manifest by works, and by works was made perfect. That is, his works showed that he had perfect faith. By proceeding to offer Isaac upon the altar, he showed his faith in the power of God to raise him from the dead, and thus to fulfill the promise, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." See *Hebrews 11:17-19*. James himself says by the offering of Isaac the scripture was fulfilled which says, "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness," thus showing that he was justified by faith and not by works; and so when he says that Abraham was justified by works, it is in a secondary sense, since it was the works alone which showed that he had saving faith. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 376.4*

It was the same with Rahab. James says, "Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way." *James 2:25*. Paul says, "By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace." *Hebrews 11:31*. Now both are strictly correct. Rahab was justified by faith; but she would not have been justified by faith if her faith had been merely a simple assent to the fact that God was leading the Israelites. Such a belief as that would not have been real faith. But she had so strong a faith in what she had heard about God's leading the Israelites into the land of Canaan, that she did the works required of her, and so in a secondary sense she was justified by works, since it was her works that testifies to the reality of her faith. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 376.5*

These scriptures show how inseparable are faith and works. So closely united are they that the possession of one presupposes the possession of the other. Yet it must not be forgotten that faith is first. There can be no works where there is no faith. We read: "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith," and, "the just shall live by faith." This is literally true. It is also true, as Paul says, that "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." *Romans 10:9*. Also when the jailer asked, "What shall I do to be saved?" Paul answered him truly, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." *Acts 16:31*. This may be said to comprise all that is necessary for salvation, because works are included in faith; they follow it as surely as flowers follow the showers of spring. If a man has the faith of Abraham, he will do the works of Abraham; if a man really believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, he will bring forth works "meet for repentance." *W. SITI June 23, 1887, page 376.6*

"The Lord Not Slack" The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

"But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." *2 Peter 3:8. SITI June 23, 1887, page 379.1*

This is a much abused text. It has no doubt been quoted, in part, at least, by thousands who have never read it; and of the thousands who have read it, probably comparatively few realized its force. We say the text is much abused, because it is almost always referred to to sustain some erroneous opinion. One will quote it as proof that "the day of the Lord" (see *verse 10*; *1 Thessalonians 5:2*, etc.) is a thousand years long; but the text does not intimate anything of the kind, and from other texts it may clearly be shown that "the day of the Lord" is not a thousand years long. Another will quote it as proof that the days of creation were not literal days, but that they were periods of at least a thousand years. This is even worse than the other; for the sacred record shows beyond the possibility of an intelligent doubt that the days of creation were literal days of twenty-four hours each. Still others hold that the text shows that the coming of the Lord may not come for a thousand years or more. This also is a gross perversion. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 379.2*

The real force of the text can only be learned from the context. The chapter is devoted wholly to the second coming of Christ. The apostle tells us that some will say, "Where is the promise of his coming?" The word "promise" here is evidently used in an accommodated sense, as meaning the prospect of the fulfillment of the promise; they can easily read the promise in the Bible, but they are skeptical as to its fulfillment, as is shown by their saying, "For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." *SITI June 23, 1887, page 379.3*

The apostle cites the case of the flood, and says that the same word that formed the earth a liquid mass in the beginning, and stored up within it the elements of its destruction, still keeps it stored with fire reserved against the day of Judgment, and perdition of ungodly men. Just as surely as the world was once destroyed by water, so surely will it again be destroyed by fire.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 379.4*

But, then, the objector will urge that it has been a long time since the signs which Christ gave (see *Matthew 24*) were fulfilled, and there seems to be almost as much to be done now as then. He is like the "evil servant" who says in his heart, "My Lord delayeth his coming." To all such the apostle says that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." What does this mean? Simply this, that God, being infinite, and inhabiting eternity, does not regard time as we do, whose lives are but a vapor that appeareth for a little time and then passeth away. A thousand years are in his sight as one day. That is, compared with his eternity, a thousand years is but as a day would be to us.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 379.5*

Does this, then, give any color to the idea that the coming of the Lord may be perhaps thousands of years distant? Not by any means; for the Scriptures plainly teach that after certain signs have taken place, Christ's coming is near, "even at the doors." Those signs have been seen; and now to the one who says that at the rate the truth has been going to the nations of the earth, it will require many, many years for all people to be warned, the apostle says that "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years." That is, in one day he can accomplish as much as in a thousand years, if he so chooses. He has infinite resources at his command, and he has promised that he will "finish the work and cut it short in righteousness," and will make a short work on the earth. He who is able to raise up children to Abraham, of the stones of the earth, is able to raise up laborers sufficient to do in one week as much work in warning the world of Christ's coming as has been done in the last hundred years. What he has promised he is able to perform; he has all time for his own; and since he has given his word, we may *know* that Christ's coming is "at the doors," no matter how much appearances may be to the contrary.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 379.6*

The fact that a thousand years are with the Lord as one day, shows that "the Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness, but is longsuffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Instead, therefore, of caviling at the promise of God, or wickedly saying in our hearts, "My Lord delayeth his coming," we should thank God for his longsuffering in waiting for us to get ready for the coming of the Lord, and should cast off the works of darkness, and put on the armor of light, knowing that the night is far spent, and the day is at hand. W.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 379.7*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

J. T. C. writes: "As Oregon is about to vote on an amendment to the constitution, to prohibit the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors, what should Seventh-day Adventists do,-vote for it, or sit still?" We answer unhesitatingly, Vote for it, by all means. When prohibition is joined to a political party, there are many temperance people who cannot conscientiously vote for it, and this is especially true, when, as is usually the case, the party favors Sunday laws. But when the question of prohibition comes before the people on its own merits, as a simple amendment to the constitution, and not as a political issue, every good citizen should use all his influence in favor of it.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.1*

The New York *Observer* remarks that there are at least two classes in that community who can "look upon the record of the last Legislature with feelings of profound satisfaction. They are the liquor dealers and the pool-sellers." There is yet another class who, along with these two, ought to look upon that Legislature with profound satisfaction. To satisfy a capricious demand of the churches, that same Legislature made the Sabbath of the Lord a half-holiday. Perhaps, however, the satisfaction on their part will not be so profound as is desired until the Sabbath is made wholly a holiday, and the Sunday rigorously enforced upon all people. But with politics as it is, and with the start that they have, it is probable that their supreme satisfaction will not be long delayed.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.2*

June 4, Cardinal Gibbons arrived in Baltimore from Rome, whither he went to receive the red hat from the Pope. His return was in such state as befitted "a prince of the church." It is true that the Government did not send a revenue cutter to meet him, as was done for the Papal ablegate last fall, but the railroad company provided a special car for him, and all the officials of the city of Baltimore headed the immense procession which turned out to do him honor. After parading the streets to the music of no less than eleven bands, the procession halted at the cathedral; "his eminence" entered, and sat down upon *his throne*, when the clergy were graciously allowed to approach him and kiss his great ring. And all this was an "informed reception" tendered to a "prince" who "reigns" in Republican America.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.3*

One of the chief characteristics of the denomination known as Disciples, is its teaching that the moral law is abolished. It is therefore with equal surprise and pleasure that we find the following in the *Christian Standard*,

the leading journal of that denomination:-*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.4*

"All of the commands of the stone tables are 'thou shalt not's' and warnings. But there is the same love in the law as in the gospel. The difference is only one of expression, as when I warn one against venturing into a roaring flood, and when, on his leaping madly in, I follow to save him. In the law love warns; in the gospel it plunges in and saves."*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.5*

The truth on that point could not be more clearly and tersely put. It expresses the exact relation of the law and the gospel. The law warns the man of the danger; when its warning has been unheeded, the gospel pulls the man out; then the law still warns him to keep out.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.6*

Says Prof. W. H. Green, D. D., in the *Sunday School Times* of May 28:-*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.7*

"The obligation of the Sabbath is based upon the Lord's example in the work of creation, and his blessing the Sabbath-day (*Genesis 2:3*), which, like every other blessing connected with creation, was pronounced at the time, and not deferred until the promulgation of the fourth commandment from Mount Sinai. The Sabbath was made for man (*Mark 2:27*), not for the Jews alone. This command is of universal obligation, as truly as any other in the decalogue."*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.8*

These statements do not derive their truth from the fact that they are made by Professor Green; they are true whether anyone believes them or not. They are a part of the Bible truths concerning the Sabbath, which the SIGNS is constantly teaching. Perhaps some who do not dare to trust their own judgment as to the truth of any statement, may accept what Professor Green says as a foundation upon which to build positive knowledge for themselves on the Sabbath question.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.9*

It is a fixed principle that a law must always carry with it a penalty; and of course the law-making power must prescribe the penalty. It is also true that the one who makes a law has the right and the power to pardon the transgressor. Now let us apply these principles to the idea that the apostles made laws for the guidance of Christians. If it is claimed that the apostles did enact the moral laws which people are now to follow, then it must also be claimed that they had power to execute the penalty of the law upon the transgressor, or to forgive him. But they are dead, and therefore if they were lawgivers, and their laws are to be enforced, they must either be somewhere administering the government of the earth, or else they must have committed their power to someone else on earth. This savors considerably of Catholic doctrine, and of Popery; but it is not the worst error into which they fall, who claim that the apostles made laws to take the place of the law of God. If they made laws which superseded the Sinaitic law, then of course the sacrifice of Christ, who was offered for the transgressions of the law, can be of no avail under the new law. Therefore it follows that if the law of God be done away, and a new law made by the apostles be in force, one of three things must exist: either there is no pardon for transgressors, or another sacrifice has been made, or else every sinner atones for his own sins. But neither of these can be the case; for besides the name of Christ, "there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." *Acts 3:12*. There is no salvation in any other. It seems strange that people with reasoning faculties should say that the apostles made the laws which we are now to obey. Even a child must see that so long as God is king and judge of the universe, so long must the entire universe, not excepting the inhabitants of this little earth, be subject to his law. And he has but one law, and that is the perfect, holy, just, and good law which was spoken from Mount Sinai.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.10*

When we speak slightly of the "advanced thought" of this generation, we must not be understood as deprecating new ideas. There are two kinds of advanced thought. One is the kind which does not begin to advance till it has turned aside from the truth. When a man turns his face from the word of God, every step of his advance must be into deeper darkness. The farther he goes with his face from the word, the deeper is his darkness, and consequently the more "advanced" ideas he has, the greater is his exhibition of human folly. But the man who clings to the law may advance as much as he pleases. He will find in it enough for constant meditation. To such, knowledge is promised: "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." *John 7:17*. "For the Lord giveth wisdom; out of his mouth cometh knowledge and understanding. He layeth up sound wisdom for the righteous; he is a buckler to them that walk uprightly." *Proverbs 2:6, 7*. And "the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." *Proverbs 4:18*. The man who clings close to the law, may welcome new ideas; yea, he may earnestly pray, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." *Psalms 119:18*.*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.11*

In the May *Missionary Review* Dr. McCosh tells the story of two young men, graduates of Princeton, both of whom were sons of missionaries, and were born in India, who started out last fall to visit the various colleges and theological seminaries, and invite students to declare themselves to be "willing and desirous, God permitting, to be foreign missionaries." As the result of their work, 1,800 students, out of about 100 educational institutions, have signified their desire to become missionaries. Dr. McCosh thinks that the majority, at least, of those who have offered themselves are sincere and thoroughly in earnest, and says that

if the movement is genuine it lays a great responsibility on the church. The point is that the church expects to convert the world, and can with difficulty secure the funds to support those who are already in foreign fields. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.12*

“The Eighth Day” The Signs of the Times, 13, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

There is no greater cause for wonder in this age of wonders, than the inventions which men devise to bolster up Sunday keeping. We know of no so-called argument that has ever been invented that is more wonderful than that which makes *Ezekiel 43:26, 27* a basis for Sunday observance. The wonder is that people with the ability to read and reason for themselves should seriously entertain it. The verses read as follows:—*SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.13*

“Seven days shall they purge the altar and purify it; and they shall consecrate themselves. And when these days are expired, it shall be, that upon the eighth day, and so forward, the priests shall make your burnt offerings upon the altar, and your peace offerings; and I will accept you, saith the Lord God.” *SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.14*

This reference to “the eighth day” is said to be a prophetic statement that Sunday should be kept. We wonder (1) how people who cannot locate the Sabbath of the fourth commandment, can so readily tell on what day the seven days of purification were to begin, so as to make the eighth day come on Sunday; (2) how, after they have so begun their count as to make the eighth day fall on Sunday, they would manage to have the next eighth day come on Sunday also; (3) how they make “upon the eighth day, *and so forward*” refer to every eighth day; and (4) how they can find in a Jewish sacrificial ordinance the slightest reference to a rest-day of any kind. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.15*

The argument from this text is so flimsy, so far fetched, and so absurd, that it seems like folly to notice it, yet honest people who were groping for light, have stumbled over it. One text will show the absurdity of the argument. In *Leviticus 22:27* we read: “When a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat, is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the dam; and from the eighth day and thenceforth it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire unto the Lord.” Now according to the Sunday argument from *Ezekiel 43:27*, this means that the young sheep or goat should remain with its mother seven days, and that on every eighth day afterward it should be offered for a burnt-offering! That is absurd, it is true, but no more so than it is to talk about keeping Sunday on every eighth day. *SITI June 23, 1887, page 384.16*

"What Condemns Men?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

Solomon, the man to whom God gave wisdom such as none ever had before or since his time, sums up everything as follows: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14*. There is a very close connection between these two verses. The statement in *verse 14* depends upon that in *verse 13*. To fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man; and the necessity of performing this duty is enforced by the statement that God shall bring every work into judgment, *with every secret thing*. From these verses, then, we learn: (1) That the ten commandments contain the whole duty of man; there is no duty outside of them; (2) That the ten commandments are the standard by which men shall be judged; for they are to be judged according to what they have done, and the ten commandments is what they are required to do; (3) That the Judgment will take into account every work, and every secret thing; and (4) That therefore the ten commandments cover every work and every secret thing, that is, every thought. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.1*

From the nature of the law of God we know that it must of necessity cover every work or thought for which it is possible for God to call men to account. 1. It contains the *whole duty* of man. 2. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." *Psalms 19:7*. If it is perfect, the man who obeys it strictly must also be perfect, and God requires nothing more than this. *Matthew 5:48*. 3. Above all, it is the statement of God's character, which is perfect righteousness. God himself calls his law "my righteousness." *Isaiah 51:5-7*. It is the will of God. *Romans 2:17, 18*. Now since all God requires of men, in order that he may admit them into his eternal kingdom, is that they should do his will (*Matthew 7:21*), therefore there can be no duty for man outside of the ten commandments. It is utterly impossible to conceive of any sin which is not forbidden by some one of the commandments. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.2*

When this statement is made, people sometimes cite the case of the ancient Israelites, who were required to bring offerings and make sacrifices for sin. On the day of atonement an offering was to be made for the whole congregation, to atone for the sins of all the people; and it was declared that whoever should not afflict his soul on that day should be cut off from among the people. Now it is asked which one of the ten commandments was violated by the man who refused to regard the day of atonement; and the idea intended to be conveyed by the questioner is that there are moral duties outside of the ten commandments. Again we are cited to the ordinance of baptism as something which the Lord requires, but which the commandments say nothing about. Both these objections are the same, and are covered by the question which we have been asked, "What commandment does a man violate by not having faith in Christ?" We think it can be shown that although death will be the portion of those who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, their destruction comes primarily and solely because they have not kept the commandments. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.3*

1. In *Romans 6:23* we read that "the wages of sin is death." Wherever there is death there must have been sin, for without sin there is no death. But "sin is the transgression of the law" (*1 John 3:4*), and therefore it is certain that all who shall be "punished with everlasting destruction," will be punished because they have broken the law. But the law to which the apostle refers is the ten commandments, for Paul says that it was only the law which says, "Thou shalt not covet," that convicted him of sin. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.4*

2. We are also told that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." *Romans 3:23*. "Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." *Romans 5:12*. "There is none righteous, no, not one." *Romans 3:10*. All men then are condemned to death, and condemned solely by the law of God. When Christ was upon earth, he was not acting as judge, but as reconciler, and therefore he did not condemn sinners. He did not come to condemn, but to save. He himself said: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." *John 3:17, 18*. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.5*

3. This being true, it follows that nothing which pertains to Christ's work of saving men, can condemn them. Christ came to save the world, not to condemn the world. Therefore nothing in his work of saving the world can condemn the world. Let the reader bear in mind the reason why Christ did not come to condemn. It was not because he had any sympathy for sin, but because he came to save. Now the very fact that he came to save, shows that they were lost. They had violated the law of God, and consequently were "condemned already." *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.6*

4. The ancient sacrifices, like baptism and the Lord's Supper, were connected with Christ's work of saving

men. They were part of the gospel. Men who are "condemned already" may be justified by believing in Jesus. *Romans 3:24-26*. Christ has died, and we are saved by faith in him. Our faith in him brings strength to overcome (*1 John 5:4*), but first we must have the "remission of sins that are past," which is given in return for simple faith in Christ's sacrifice. Now all the ancient sacrifices of the Jews were simply means by which they showed their faith in the Messiah, whose blood could take away sin. In like manner baptism and the Lord's Supper are ceremonies by which we show our faith in Christ's death and resurrection. Someone may say that many of the Jews did not understand the full meaning of their sacrifices, and did not fully understand the work of Christ. Very true, and so thousands of professed Christians do not understand the full meaning of baptism and the Lord's Supper; yet the fact remains that these ceremonies are for the purpose of manifesting faith in Christ, and the object for which they were designed is not affected in the least by the ignorance of any who may use them. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.7*

5. From the above, it will readily be seen that a refusal to offer sacrifices, or to take part in the exercise of the atonement day, indicated a lack of faith in Christ as the Saviour of sinners. Since Christ has ordained that men shall show their faith in him, if they have any, by the ordinances of the gospel, it follows that those who reject those ordinances, do so because they reject Christ and his sacrifice. In other words, they refuse pardon and salvation. All such, without any doubt, will suffer destruction; but it must be remembered that the penalty which they suffer is not as a punishment for failure to comply with the provisions of the gospel, but for the sins which they have committed, from which they might have been freed by accepting the gospel. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.8*

Let us illustrate this by something which is more common. Here is a murderer who is under sentence of death. He is told that the Governor will pardon him if he will acknowledge his guilt and make application for pardon, promising, of course, to obey the law in the future. But he refuses to do this, and the law is allowed to take its course, and the man is hanged. Now why is the man hanged? Is he hanged because he refused to sue for pardon? Of course not. He is hanged for the murder. There is no law saying that a man *must* apply for pardon, and making death the penalty of refusal, but there is a law against murder, and death is the penalty for its violation. Whoever commits murder is condemned, and is subject to the penalty. If he is hanged, even though a pardon has been offered and rejected, he is hanged solely for the murder. No part of the penalty is inflicted because he refused the pardon, although every particle of the penalty would have been remitted if he had accepted the pardon. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.9*

Carry the illustration a little farther: Here are two murderers in their cells awaiting execution. Both are equally guilty; their crime is the same. Now suppose that pardon is freely offered to one, but not to the other. The one who has been offered pardon refuses it, and both he and the one that had no pardon offered him are hanged. Now which is the guiltier man of the two. When they were put in their cells, both had the same degree of guilt. Has the one who refused to be pardoned acquired additional guilt by that refusal? Not by any means. If he is hanged, he is hanged for precisely the same reason that the other one is, -because he has broken the law. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.10*

So it is with the sinner in his relation to the law of God. He is "condemned already." Now Christ comes, offering pardon; if the sinner accepts it, he may be saved; but if he refuses pardon, then the curse of the law, death, is allowed to fall upon him. God *invites* men to be saved, but he has no law to *compel* them to be pardoned. The refusal to receive the pardon is not that for which men are destroyed, but it is the sins which they committed and which condemned them even before the way of salvation was made known to them. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.11*

Now if it is borne in mind that a failure to comply with the provisions of the gospel, whether in the so-called old dispensation or in the new, is simply a refusal to receive the pardon which the gospel brings, it will be seen that the fact that men were cut off for not afflicting their souls on the day of atonement, is no evidence whatever that the death penalty is inflicted for anything save violation of the ten commandments. As Christ said, "He that believeth not is condemned already." *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.12*

"Sin is the transgression of the law." *1 John 4:3*. "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." *Romans 3:23*. Not merely have all men broken the law as a whole, but all men have broken every portion of the law, as it is written: "There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." *Romans 3:10-12*. We read also that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." *Romans 14:23*. Therefore if we were asked, "What commandment does a man violate if he doesn't have faith in Christ?" we should reply that he breaks them all, or rather that he is a breaker of all of them, and that his punishment will be inflicted for such violation and not for his lack of faith. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.13*

Once more: Sin is active and positive. Failure to have faith is not an act at all. It is the absence of action. It is a passive condition, which leaves him exposed to punishment for sin, but it is not of itself a sin for which he is to be punished. But enough has been said to make the point clear, that violation of the law of God, and that

alone, brings punishment. Let no one think that we lightly regard the ordinances of the gospel. We do not. No one can lightly regard them if he has any just conception of the law of God. But they are not primary duties. The punishment which will be inflicted upon the finally impenitent will be death, just what would have been inflicted upon man if the gospel had never been introduced. The gospel, with its ordinances, furnishes the way by which man may escape the wages of his sins, and therefore it is of the most vital importance. To those who imagine that a belief that men are punished only for violation of the moral law must be at least a partial ignoring of the gospel, the following words are in place:-*SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.14*

"And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to *his deeds*." *Romans 2:3-6*. W.*SITI June 30, 1887, page 390.15*

"Cut Off from Among His People" The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

Just as we were writing the article, "What Condemns Man," in which we made reference to the cutting off of those who would not afflict their souls on the day of atonement (*Leviticus 23:29*) the following question was received:-*SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.1*

"In *Leviticus 23:29* it is said that 'whatsoever soul it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people.' Does this mean that they were to be killed, or only separated from the people?" *SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.2*

We think the text means that they were to be killed, and the following are some of the reasons for so thinking:-*SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.3*

1. Where the expression "cut off" is used in other similar instances, it is known to mean death. In *2 Samuel 7:9* we read that the Lord had cut off all the enemies of David out of his sight. There can be no question as to the meaning of this. Again, the Lord promised to send an angel before the Israelites, and to "cut off" the Amorites, the Hittites, the Canaanites, etc. *Exodus 23:23*. And in *Joshua 23:3, 4* we read that the great nations had been cut off. We know that those nations had been exterminated. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.4*

In *2 Chronicles 32:21* we read thus of Sennacherib, who had invaded Judah: "And the Lord sent an angel, which cut off all the mighty men of valour, and the leaders and captains in the camp of the king of Assyria. So he returned with shame of face to his own land. And when he was come into the house of his god, they that came forth of his own bowels slew him there with the sword." Compare this with *2 Kings 10:35-37*, and it will be seen that this cutting off of the mighty men of valor, was the killing of one hundred and eighty-five thousand men. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.5*

More positive proof is found in *Exodus 31:14*: "Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore; for it is holy unto you. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people." Here we see that being "cut off from among his people" is the same as being put to death. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.6*

In *Numbers 15:30, 31* we are told that the soul that should do aught presumptuously should be "cut off from among his people," and again that he should "utterly be cut off," and in the verses following we are told that one who presumptuously profaned the Sabbath was stoned to death with stones. Read now the sins that are forbidden in *Leviticus 18:7-26*, of which it is said: "For whosoever shall commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit them shall be cut off from among their people." *Verse 20*. And then read in *Leviticus 20:2-16* the same list of sins, where it is stated of each one that those who do them "shall surely be put to death." These passages, with many others that might be mentioned, show clearly what meaning usually attaches to the expression "cut off," or "cut off from among his people." *SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.7*

2. This is still more apparent when we consider the meaning of the day of atonement, and the whole Jewish sanctuary service. The Jewish priests served "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things." *Hebrews 8:4, 5*. Each year of service closed with the day of atonement, and was a type of the whole gospel dispensation. The day of atonement, closing the year of sanctuary service, was a type of the general Judgment, closing the period of human probation. In the work of the sanctuary service the Jews had before them continually a graphic representation of the penalty of the law and of the great propitiation. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.8*

When the sinner brought his victim to the door of the sanctuary; and, having confessed his sins upon it, killed it, he signified (1) That the wages of sin is death; (2) That he himself was worthy of death because of his sins; and (3) That he believed in the Lamb of God, who should take away the sin of the world. When the offering was placed upon the altar and entirely burned up, the fate of the victim that was offered for sin showed them what the sinner himself justly merited; and thus they learned that "the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away." *Psalm 37:29.SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.9*

At that time God was leading his people directly. The Jewish Government was a pure theocracy. Consequently when outbreaking crimes were committed, the offenders were at once put to death. This was not meant to take the place of a final judgment, but was an indication of how God would deal with sinners. So when we come to the closing up of the Jewish service, to the day when the priest made an atonement for the people, to cleanse them from all their sins, the man who obstinately refused to humble himself, with contrition of heart, was cut off, put to death, just as will be done to those who, at the close of the real Judgment, shall be found impenitent. The people of Israel were the people of God; they had his law and his gospel. To be cut off from Israel was to be cut off from God as a worthless branch, and the death penalty was inflicted at once, and thus the type of the real work connected with the sanctuary in Heaven was completed.*SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.10*

It is very common to speak of the finally impenitent, that when the Judgment closes they are found with their sins upon them. This is strictly true, and shows the contrast between the sinner and those whose sins have been washed away in the blood of the Lamb. There is an expression in *Numbers 9:13*, which, while it does not refer to the day of atonement, does have reference to an important feature of the sanctuary work, and shows just why those who refused to take part in any of the ceremonies of the sanctuary were cut off. The passage reads thus:-*SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.11*

"But the man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forebareth to keep the passover, even the same soul shall be cut off from among his people; because he brought not the offering of the Lord in his appointed season, that man shall bear his sin."*SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.12*

The Passover represented the sacrifice of Christ, our Passover. The man who was not hindered by absence or sickness, or some other unavoidable circumstance, from celebrating the Passover, and who should indifferently let it pass by, was to be cut off. Why? "Because he brought not the offering of the Lord in his appointed season, that man shall bear his sin." From this we may learn again, what has before been proved, that failure to accept the gospel, as indicated by neglect of its ordinances, simply left the man to bear his sins, and it was for those sins that he was cut off.*SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.13*

"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation." *Hebrews 2:1-3. W.SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.14*

"Who Are the Sadducees?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

A subscriber enters a mild protest against the doctrine taught in the SIGNS, that when man dies his soul, or spirit, or any part of him, does not continue to live, and he adds: "Are you not becoming modern Sadducees?" We have often heard it charged that those who do not believe that there is any life for the dead except by means of the resurrection, are Sadducees; but whenever we hear such a charge, we conclude that the one making it has very little idea of what the Sadducees were.*SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.15*

The Sadducees were the cultured aristocracy of the Jewish nation. Two texts of Scripture plainly tell their belief concerning the state of men after death. Read *Matthew 22:23*: "The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection," etc. Their question and Christ's answer, which we will comment upon next week, taken with this statement, show that the Sadducees did not believe that there would ever be any life for the dead. Again we read in *Acts 23:6-8*: "But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees; and the multitude was divided. For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees confess both." In direct opposition to this non-resurrection doctrine of the Sadducees, we teach that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." *Acts 21:15*. We believe that "the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his [Christ's] voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." *John 5:28, 29*.

We believe that "the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible" (*1 Corinthians 15:52*); "for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise." *1 Thessalonians 4:16*. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.16*

Now we would like to ask our friend who holds that those whom we call dead are not really dead, what he believes in regard to the resurrection. If the righteous dead are not dead at all, but are alive in Heaven, how can Christ come to receive them to himself (*John 14:1-3*)? and how can he call them from the graves, to clothe them with life and immortality? Is it not clear as noonday that they who hold that the soul of man is by nature immortal, thereby deny the necessity for, or the possibility of, a resurrection? And now, reminding our readers that the distinguishing characteristic of the Sadducees was that they denied the resurrection, we leave them to decide who in modern times most nearly represent the Sadducees-whether it is those who teach that there can be no resurrection, or those who hold that "the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (*Romans 6:23*), to be bestowed "at the resurrection of the just." *Luke 14:14*. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 391.17*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

By an inadvertence the Bible-reading which appeared in last week's SIGNS was not credited. It should have been credited to Mrs. A. W. Heald. The conclusion of the subject appears in this issue. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.1*

We are sorry that this week again, as well as last week, we are unable to furnish the regular Sabbath-school lessons, for we know that many of our readers looked anxiously for them; but we have received non to print, and therefore had no alternative. We are sure, however, of the lessons for the next two weeks, and we hope that the Sabbath-school machinery will soon get in such a good running order that the lessons may be furnished to us without any break. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.2*

The series of tent-meetings that has been in session in Oakland for the last six weeks, closed Sunday evening, June 26. The attendance has been very good through the entire series, and we think that solemn impressions have been made upon of the hearers. Seventeen have taken their stand for the truth, and others are almost persuaded to obey. While the tent-meetings are being continued in another quarter of the city, the interest started by the late effort will be followed up with personal labor; and it is hoped that several more will be gathered in. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.3*

In a private letter, Elder G. B. Starr, of Springfield, Ill., says:-*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.4*

"Well, you may rejoice with us that the Sunday bill failed to become a law. Our friends in the Senate never allowed it to go to a second reading. We feel sure that God worked for us, and held the winds for the work here a little longer. Several urgent petitions were read in the Senate and an effort was made to get the bill through; but the Senate, by a vote of 21 to 14, refused to suspend the rules to consider it. We feel very grateful to God, and shall try to consecrate ourselves anew to his service, to work harder while the day lasts." *SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.5*

We do rejoice that there are men who love justice so well that they will not listen to the voice of bigotry, but will stand against those who preach that no definite day, but only one day in seven, is required by the Lord, but will try to force others to keep a definite day of which their conscience disapproves. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.6*

From reports and comments and lesson helps (?) received at this office there can hardly be a doubt that the Sunday-school children throughout the land have actually been taught that the manna did not fall *on Sunday*, and that it would keep only over Saturday night and Sunday. Now even though the subject were a mere matter of history, and nothing more, such teaching could not be excused from the imputation of downright dishonesty, nor would it be by any intelligent person. How much less then can it be excused when the subject is one of divine truth, given by inspiration of God, and which deeply concerns the eternal interests of every human soul. Then, such teaching becomes not only dishonest but it is wicked deception, and is simply teaching rebellion against the Lord by causing the people to trust in a lie. *Jeremiah 28:15, 16*. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.7*

It has been a standing assertion among a certain class of people that wine drinking tends to temperance, because where wine is freely drunk there will be less whisky consumed. The logic of this has never been very apparent, even though it be allowed that wine drinking diminishes the amount of whisky drinking; for wine itself is an intoxicant, although not so powerful as whisky. But now the falsity of the assertion has been demonstrated. France has always been noted as the great wine country of the world; and if the assertion just

noted be true, it ought to be the most temperate. But now we learn that the drinking of spirits has assumed such proportions in that country that the Senate has decided that steps must be taken to diminish it. Drunkenness is getting so common that it cannot be endured. And this will prove to be the invariable result. The desire for stimulants always increases as it is gratified.*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.8*

Just before Cardinal Gibbons returned from Bonne, a Baltimore priest named J. L. Andreis preached to his congregation, in St. Levi Church, a discourse which was simply a mass of servile flattery of the Cardinal. It was not simple flattery, either, for the following paragraph from the "sermon" contains blasphemy as great as any that ever issued from the mouth of the beast:-*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.9*

"The importance of the threefold reception is equal to the meaning. The clergy will spontaneously be made to ask, 'Who is this that cometh from Rome with dyed garments, this beautiful one in his robe, walking in the greatness of his strength? And why is his apparel red, and his garments like them that tread in the winepress?' The answer to them will be that he is their own archbishop, whom the Vicar of Christ has made his immediate counselor, and as such has clad him in red robes," etc.*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.10*

Those to whom the blasphemy is not apparent will be able to realize it by comparing the paragraph with *Isaiah 63:1-3*.*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.11*

The report of the "Committee on the Sabbath," at the late Reformed Presbyterian Synod, says:-*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.12*

"Sunday saloons robbed the working classes of their weeks' pay, and turn the working man's home into a very healthy."*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.13*

Indeed! It is the Sunday saloon bar robs people. It is the Sunday saloon that turns people's homes into a hell! What a wicked thing that Sunday saloon is! Annihilated it by all means before next Sunday comes, so that the working classes may be perfectly secure in their money, and the working man's home may be made happy. But by all means let the dear, good, honest, week-day saloon, that makes gentle the British husband, that makes kind the cruel father, that protects the promising youth, that turns the working man's home into a paradise-let it remain, and touch it not, for a blessing is in it. Robbery and hell are found alone in the Sunday saloon.*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.14*

But what makes the Sunday saloon so intensely bad that it must be denounced more than any other saloon? Any saloon at all is an unmitigated curse. Then why condone it on weekdays by condemning it only on Sunday. If the Sunday saloon can be abolished, why cannot all be abolished? There is quite a large class of people who, realizing that the sale of intoxicates cannot yet be absolutely prohibited, propose to cut off as many saloons as possible by high license. This the Prohibitionists denominate "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell." Very well. Then the same prohibitionist will loudly denounce the Sunday saloon and demand laws that shall close the saloon on Sunday but let them run full blast all the rest of the week. What is that then but "a covenant with death and an agreement with hell," just as much as is the other? The high license folks say, "If we can't yet abolished all, we will abolish all we can." This the Prohibitionists denounce in the unmeasured terms, and then say the same thing, only in other words. We wish the Prohibitionists would stick to their text, and not so stultify themselves. Prohibition absolute, everywhere, all the time, and forever, say we.*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.15*

"The Truth Told" The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago a friend sent us a copy of the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* of April 3. It contained an article on "Sunday Legislation" by Rev. John Snyder, of St. Louis, who, while he believes in Sunday and Sunday rest, does not favor hasty legislation on the subject. He believes that Sunday should be kept because man needs a rest-day, and Sunday seems to have the majority in its favor, and he knows that the Sunday-sabbath stands on no other foundation than this. He says:-*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.16*

"The truth must be spoken, and the truth about the Sunday question is simply and briefly this: If we would preserve the day of rest for wholesome and rational use, if we would make it truly a day of peace and worship, it must frankly be placed upon a sure and solid foundation. Every instructed man knows that the Christian Sunday and the Jewish Sabbath are not identical. That the sanctions of the one cannot be transferred to the other. If there is anything plain in the Bible, it is that not 'any day,' but one particular day, is sanctified by the older law, and testified to by miracles. That day is the seventh and not the first day of the week. Every instructed man knows that the Catholic Church gave to the Christian world the Sunday, and determined the manner in which it should be used. And when Protestantism threw off the authority of the Catholic Church it abandoned the only ecclesiastical foundation upon which the Sunday can logically rest."*SITI June 30, 1887,*

"Is There Room Enough?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

"It is asserted that there is not room enough on the earth for all the people who have ever lived on it. Is there anything in print on the subject? J. M. D." *SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.18*

Yes; the folly of assertion has been shown scores of times, yet it is made with as much confidence as ever. It is a standing objection with infidels against the possibility of a general resurrection, and evinces just about as much learning as the usual run of infidel objections to the Bible. We think that the falsity of the assertion will be apparent to all who read the following brief calculation:-*SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.19*

"The present population of the world is, in round numbers, 1,400,000,000. The earth has been standing about six thousand years. It is true that many people claim that the earth is much older, but they do not claim that it has been inhabited by man for a much longer period. Now we will allow that the entire population has changed every thirty years, and that there were just as many people the first thirty years and every thirty years after, as there are now. This is an exceedingly liberal allowance, for there were but two people in the beginning, and but eight after the flood. The whole number of people, then that have lived on the earth, would be 1,000,000,000,000 or 2,000,000,000,000. Now if we should allow each one of these people a square rod of land for standing room, they would occupy only 2,734,316 square miles. The area of the United States and Territories is 3,442,198 square miles. Therefore all the people who have ever lived on the earth could be accommodated in the United States, with ample room for everyone and there would be more than 800,000 square miles of land to spare." *SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.20*

Don't be afraid when infidels prate about the impossibility of things which the Bible says shall take place. There was never an infidel assertion that could stand for a moment against the Bible. All the arguments brought to bear in the Bible have had less effect than so many feathers would have upon the rock of Gibraltar. *SITI June 30, 1887, page 400.21*

July 7, 1887

"The Question of the Sadducees" The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

"The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him, Saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother. Now there were with us seven brethren; and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother; likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh. And last of all the woman died also. Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her. Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine teaching."

Matthew 22:23-33. SITI July 7, 1887, page 406.1

Well might the multitude be astonished at the wonderful readiness with which the Master put to silence the cavilings of the infidel Sadducees. The reply of Jesus was simple, as was all of our Lord's teaching, -so very simple that people who are looking for a great display often misunderstand it. First of all, it must be premised that Jesus exactly and completely answered the objection which the Sadducees raised. They denied the resurrection, and brought a hypothetical case to show, as they supposed, that the doctrine of the resurrection could not be reconciled with the teachings of Moses. Thus they hoped to put Jesus to confusion before the multitude, who revered Moses as a prophet of God. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 406.2*

The first thing that Jesus said to the Sadducees was, "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God." This was said in view of their denial of the resurrection. The same may with propriety be said to all who deny the resurrection, or who, while professedly believing in the resurrection, hold theories which are virtually denials of it. They who know the Scriptures, know that the dead will be raised, for the Scriptures are full of this doctrine; scores of texts which do not speak directly of the resurrection, prove that doctrine most conclusively, when, like the one with which our Saviour silenced the Sadducees, they are correctly interpreted. And they who know the power of God will never cavil at anything which his word declares shall be done. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 406.3*

Since the Sadducees denied the resurrection, and asked their question in order to prove that there could be no such thing, we must conclude that the reply of Jesus was positive proof that there will be a resurrection. Let us read his proof again: "As touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." From the expression, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," may have supposed that Jesus taught that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were then living, and that Jesus met the caviling of the Sadducees by proving to them the immortality of the soul. But if that were the case, their objection would not have been answered. They were denying the resurrection of the dead. Now if Jesus had given them a discourse on the immortality of the soul, and had claimed that the essential part of man, the man himself, can never die, he would not have touched their objection, nor proved anything about the resurrection of the dead. On the contrary, if he had proved that the patriarchs and all others never really died, he would have denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead as much as the Sadducees did. If there be no death, there can be no resurrection. Therefore we must conclude that since Jesus effectually silenced the Sadducees in their denial of the resurrection, he did not assume that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had never really died, and were then living. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 406.4*

To make this more evident, we quote Christ's words as recorded by Mark. Jesus said: "For when they shall rise from the dead, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven. And as touching the dead, that they rise; have ye not read in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?" *Mark 12:25, 26.* Here it is evident that Christ based his argument on the fact that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were *dead*; for he says that the words of God at the bush (see *Exodus 3:1-6*) are proof that *the dead rise*. Such an argument could not have been made if the patriarchs were the alive in some part of the universe. Christ's answer to the Pharisees proves that the dead are not in existence, as fully as it proves that there will be a resurrection of the dead; for he could not prove the resurrection of the dead if there were no dead. Those, therefore, who say that Jesus here taught that the soul of man never dies, not only occupy the Sadducean ground that there can be no resurrection, but they do so in the face of Christ's positive argument showing that the dead shall rise. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 406.5*

If we turn to Luke's account we shall find still more light on this matter: "And Jesus answering said unto them,

The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage; but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; *neither can they die any more*; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Now that the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush," etc. *Luke 20:34-37*. Here we learn that Jesus was speaking of those who are *dead*, as were the Sadducees themselves. The resurrection is spoken of as something future, for "they which *shall be accounted worthy to obtain* that world, and the resurrection from the dead," cannot "*die any more*." *SITI July 7, 1887, page 406.6*

It seems impossible that anyone should carefully read what Jesus said to the Sadducees, as recorded by the three evangelists, and still claim that he held to the idea of the conscious existence of those who are called dead. Such an idea is not reconcilable with his words; for he speaks of *the dead*, which he could not do if there were no dead; and he says that the dead shall *rise*, which he could not say if they had already risen, not from the dead, but from this life to a higher one; and he says they who are accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection from the dead, *cannot die any more*, which would be nonsense if nobody had ever died. If Jesus had held the theory that "there is no death," as professed theologians of this day often claim, he could only have said, "Moses showed that there are no dead, but that those whom you call dead are living;" but in that case he would not have touched their anti-resurrection theory, neither would he have shown the folly of their supposed case of the woman and the seven brothers. What he did show was that those who are dead have not perished beyond the hope of recovery; God does not call himself the God of creatures which exist for a brief space and then become as extinct as the crumbling leaf. But he is God "both of the dead and living," for the dead are having only a temporary sleep; God's thoughtful care for them does not cease when they die; but he marks the place where they lie, and at the last day "he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather his elect," and the dead in Christ shall come forth from their graves. See *Matthew 24:31; John 5:28, 29; 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17*. They rise to immortal life, and the little time they have unconsciously slept is as though it were no break in their lives. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 406.7*

It will be worth while to notice more particularly how completely the objection of the Sadducees was met and answered. Jesus said that they erred because they did not know the Scriptures; and then he showed wherein, by stating that in the resurrection there would be no marrying nor giving in marriage, because, being children of the resurrection, they could not die any more. The arrangement to which the Pharisees referred (see *Deuteronomy 25:5-19; Ruth 3:11-13; 4:1-6*) was made so that a man's inheritance in the land of Canaan might not pass out of his family. If a man died without an heir, his property would pass into other hands; but if his brother should marry his widow, the first-born was to be counted as the heir of the one who died, and thus the homestead would be retained. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 406.8*

But all this will be unnecessary for those who "shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead," for the Scripture says that "they shall build houses, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build, and another inhabit; they shall not plant, and another eat; for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands." *Isaiah 65:21, 22*. They cannot die any more, therefore there is no need of any arrangement for keeping the inheritance in the family. The new earth, the inheritance promised to Abraham, will after the resurrection and its restoration be portioned out to all who are Christ's and consequently Abraham's seed. *Galatians 3:29*. The whole earth will be thus divided, and then each man's inheritance will remain unimpaired throughout eternity. Thanks be to God, who has devised means "that his banished be not expelled from him," and who, though the dead are "as water spilt on the ground, which cannot be gathered up again" (compare *2 Samuel 14:14* and *Job 14:10-12*), can call himself their God, through his power to quicken the dead, and call "those things which be not as though they were." *Romans 4:17*. W. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 406.9*

"We Have Abraham to Our Father" The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

"And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." *Matthew 3:9*. These are the words which John the Baptist spoke to the Pharisees and Sadducees who came to his baptism. These men were corrupt at heart. Their character is described by our Saviour himself in *Matthew 23:13-33*, where they are said to have outwardly appeared righteous, while within they were full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Both John the Baptist and our Saviour called them vipers. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 407.1*

These men were lineal descendants of Abraham, and were of the stock of Israel, but they had lost the spirit of Israel. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob confessed that they were pilgrims and strangers on the earth. *Hebrews 11:13*. They did not expect their portion in this life, nor an earthly inheritance; but they looked for a city from Heaven, and an inheritance in the new earth, wherein righteousness alone should dwell. *2 Peter 3:13*. And they knew that the possession of righteousness would be the only passport to that heavenly inheritance. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 407.2*

The Pharisees, on the other hand, had ceased to look for a Messiah who should finally reign over a righteous nation, and who should prepare subjects for that kingdom by cleansing them from sin. They did not look at their hearts, which were corrupt, but only on the outward appearance, which was fair. Consequently, seeing no sin in themselves, they felt no need of a Saviour. And so they came to John's baptism, not because they felt any need of flying from the wrath to come, but because they thought that by enrolling themselves in the ranks of the new leader, whose coming John announced, they would be sure of places of honor in the coming kingdom. They expected that that kingdom would bring simply emancipation from the Roman yoke, and would place the Jewish nation in the seat of dominion over the whole world; and they had not the slightest doubt but that they would have a place in the kingdom, because they were children of Abraham. Their sole anxiety was to have as high a place as possible. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 407.3*

John saw through their mask of hypocrisy, and told them that they need not flatter themselves that they were children of Abraham. The promise to Abraham and to his seed would be fulfilled, but sooner than count them as the seed of Abraham, God would raise up children unto Abraham, out of the stones of the ground. The inheritance was promised to Abraham, not because God regarded his person or his descent as superior to that of other men, but because he had the righteousness of faith. Consequently those who are counted as heirs with him, must be men of like character. It certainly would not be just to accept Abraham solely because of his faith in God, and to accept others solely on account of their parentage. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 407.4*

Afterward, when Christ was talking to the wicked Jews, he said, "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." *John 8:39*. The apostle Paul also says, "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." *Galatians 3:29*. The Pharisees who came to John to be baptized thought that the fact that they could prove their descent from Abraham, would insure them a place in the kingdom of Christ; but Paul shows that they had turned the matter around. They could only prove themselves children by bringing forth such works of repentance as would show them to be Christ's. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 407.5*

There are many today who have as erroneous ideas of the kingdom of Christ as the Pharisees and the Sadducees had. There is a large party called the National Reform Association, whose members think that Christ's kingdom is going to be established at the polls, by the voices of men. And they imagine that they are sure of a place in that kingdom, because they can trace their ancestry back to the Covenanters, or some of the Reformers. They forget that the Reformers did not follow the multitude, but took the Bible for their guide, as far as its truths were revealed to them, and that in following its teachings they suffered untold hardships. The Reformers became such solely because their love for God and his truth was so great as to lead them to endure privation and to be considered as outcasts. And yet these men imagine that they can ride into the kingdom of God on the top wave of popularity. How terribly mistaken they will some day be. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 407.6*

The kingdom of Christ is promised only to the true Israel, but the true Israel are only those "whose praise is not of men, but of God." *Romans 2:29*. Those who will be great in that kingdom, must be content to be small here; and whosoever will be chief, must be a servant; "even as the Son of man [the King himself] came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." *Matthew 20:28*. He was in the form of God, and had all glory and honor, yet when he saw the lost world, he did not think his glory was a thing to be desired, so he laid it all aside, and "made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth." *Philippians 2:7-10*. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 407.7*

"The servant is not great than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him." Let none therefore imagine that he is going to get into the kingdom on the strength of a profession, nor because he is a descendant of the Reformers, nor because he is a member of a large and influential church organization. Let none think that he can be more favored than the King, and can obtain the kingdom by any other means than humble self-denial and a godly life. Neither let any think that Christ's reception of the kingdom depends on them. He receives his kingdom from the Father (*Psalms 2:7, 9; Daniel 7:13, 14*), and will admit into it only those who upon the foundation of faith have built a superstructure of virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, and charity. *2 Peter 1:5-11*. W. *SITI July 7, 1887, page 407.8*

"The Baptism of Fire" The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

To the multitude who ad come to the banks of Jordan to be baptized, John the Baptist said: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." *Matthew 3:11*. There is no question but that

the baptism of the Holy Spirit was administered on the day of Pentecost, although it is not probable that John had special reference to that occasion. That was simply a notable example of what John said should take place. All believers in Christ must be baptized with the Spirit, and must "walk in the Spirit," if they share the final reward. But many people suppose that the baptism of fire was also administered on the day of Pentecost, which is a grave error.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 408.1*

The next verse plainly indicates what was meant by the baptism of fire: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." This shows that although the words of *verse 11* were addressed to all the multitude, John did not mean that all should receive both the baptism of the Holy Ghost and the baptism of fire. He might baptize them all with water, and thus they might all be counted by men as followers of Christ; but He who should come after, would have his fan in his hand, and would thoroughly purge his floor, saving the wheat, and burning up the chaff in the fire. This is the meaning of John's words. The expression, "He will thoroughly purge his floor," shows that especial reference is made here to those who, by baptism, have professed to be Christ's. It was well understood by all that those who did not profess to be Christ's would be destroyed, but here they are shown that a profession alone is not sufficient, because the floor will be purged.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 408.2*

Now there was no baptism of fire on the day of Pentecost. It is true that "there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them" (*Acts 2:3*), but this was not a baptism of fire. In the first place it is not said that there was actual fire present, but something which had the appearance of fire. Secondly, even if it had been fire, it would not have constituted a baptism of fire, for baptism is not administered in that way. Baptism means immersion, or an overwhelming. The disciples were baptized with the Holy Spirit, because "it filled all the house where they were sitting." They were completely submerged in the Spirit. And the cloven tongues like fire formed a part of this manifestation of the Spirit.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 408.3*

But who will receive the baptism of fire? All those who do not receive the Spirit, or who, having once received it, do not walk in it, they will be burned up in that fire that shall burn as an oven. In *Revelation 20:10; 21:8* it is said that the wicked shall have their part in a "lake of fire." The whole earth will be melted (*2 Peter 3:10*) with the fervent heat, and will present the appearance of a sea of liquid fire. "And the works that are therein shall be burned up." The destruction of the wicked in this lake of fire may, without doing violence to language, fitly be called a baptism. In this lake of fire they will be submerged, and will be consumed root and branch.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 408.4*

Thus John was speaking of two baptisms, one which saves and one which destroys. And since he was talking, not to certain individuals whose destiny he might foresee, but was talking to the multitude collectively, some of whom would be saved, and some lost, he could truthfully say to them collectively, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Some of them would receive one baptism, and some the other.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 408.5*

There are some well-meaning persons who pray to be baptized with fire; and there are hymns which call for the baptism of fire. Such prayers and hymns cannot but cause a shudder to one who knows what the baptism of fire will be. Let us pray above all things for the baptism of the Spirit, but let us pray most earnestly to be saved from the baptism of fire. *W. SITI July 7, 1887, page 408.6*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

The new meeting-house in Healdsburg will be dedicated the last Sabbath in July. More next week.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.1*

It is said that an English scientist has been making experiments by which he concludes that the effect which alcohol has upon a person is determined by the amount of brain that he possesses. He made his experiments upon pigs, which have very small brains, and found that alcohol had very low appreciable effect on them. Hereafter when a man boasts that whiskey has no effect on him, the people will know the reason.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.2*

Various comments are made upon the conviction of Jake Sharp, the notorious New York briber, but quite a common sentiment seems to be that he should receive only a nominal sentence, because he is an old man. We cannot see that age is an extenuating circumstance. On the contrary, it rather aggravates the offense. One man says that the ignorant and corrupt aldermen who were anxious to receive bribes, should be punished instead. And still another says that Sharp did what any other businessman would do, -he found a set of corrupt aldermen, and the used them to further his ends. That is to say that Sharp should not be punished,

because he would never have given bribes if somebody had not been willing to receive them. All of which shows that there is among many businessmen a very low grade of morality.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.3*

It is said that Dr. McGlynn calls himself the Martin Luther of the nineteenth century, but we fear that he is still too much of a Catholic to be able to appreciate the work of Martin Luther. The only likeness between the two men is their opposition to Popish tyranny, but their opposition is from entirely different standpoints. Martin Luther's work was wholly on a moral basis. He sought to free the minds of the people from the bondage of Papal superstition, and to teach them that "the just shall live by faith." Dr. McLynn's work has solely a political aspect. He is not seeking to reform the church nor the people outside of the church, and his aim seems to be to teach the American citizen that he shall live by free land. His opposition to the Catholic Church is only to the extent that that church opposes his land theories. There is plenty of room for reformers, but they must preach the word, and not preach land.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.4*

The "Seybert Commission" that has been investigating Spiritualism for some time, has finished its labors, and reports that Spiritualism is wholly a fraud. The members says that they had the best mediums in the world before them, and that afterwards they had a professional juggler, who did everything that the mediums did. This decision will satisfy a few people; but those who know anything of Spiritualism, whether they believe it or not, will have little regard for it. A skillful general will always conceal his movements, and no doubt Satan is pleased to have "scientific" men thus pronounce Spiritualism a fraud, so the people may still continue blind as to what Spiritualism really is, and may fall into its snare even while they are denouncing it. There is only one way to successfully investigate Spiritualism and that is with the Bible as a guide. The "investigation" conducted by the "Seybert Commission" seems to have been a very tame affair, but the very best "scientific" investigation will never amount to anything in explaining the phenomena, for the simple reason that the devil is more acute than any scientists, and can fool them every time.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.5*

"Faith Healing" The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

A correspondent of the *California Christian Advocate* says:-*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.6*

"I am persuaded the cause of religion, and Methodism in particular, is suffering to-day from 'Holiness Bands' and 'faith-cure' fanaticisms more than from any other source. If the failures to heal were reported as faithfully as the supposed cures, there would be less of the latter in a little while."*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.7*

We are convinced that this is the truth. But while we say this, we do not wish to be understood as decrying real holiness or denying the efficacy of faith in the healing of disease. What we do object to as bringing a reproach upon true religion, is "holiness" that would never be recognized if the possessor did not call attention to it, and to "faith" that is advertised as a quack doctor would advertise his nostrums. We believe most implicitly in the truth of *James 5:14, 15*. We have seen marked instances of healing in answer to prayer. We do not believe that anything that concerns the welfare of God's creatures is of too little importance for him to notice; and we believe and know that in *all* cases of necessity he may with confidence be implored for help.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.8*

But there is nothing in the Bible nor in common sense that would indicate that God will interpose to save a lazy man from starving, or that he will work a miracle to cure a man who is in distress, when a cure might be effected by taking a bath or drinking a copious draught of warm water. In other words, while we are to recognize that it is only because of God's continued care that we live at all, and that we "ought always to pray," we are not to expect God to do for us directly that which he has given us the power to do for ourselves. Neither are we to suppose that God holds himself subject to the beck of everybody who thinks he knows what he wants better than the Lord does. The Lord has all power; but for a man to set up a "cure" and advertise himself as the Lord's special agent in healing disease, and to warrant a cure every time, is blasphemous presumption.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.9*

"Rome's Work" The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

Dr. McGlynn's case is assuming pretty large proportions. The following cablegram was sent from New York to Cardinal Simconi at Rome, for the Pope, June 22:-*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.10*

"One hundred thousand Catholics, in a mass-meeting held in this city on Saturday, June 19, denounced the threatened excommunication of Dr. McGlynn, with whom they are prepared to stand, and protest against ecclesiastical interference with the political rights of American citizens.*SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.11*

JEREMIAH COUGHLIN, M. D., *Chairman*.SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.12

JAMES GAHAN, *Secretary*."SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.13

But this is not all. Owing to the continued pressure upon him from Rome, Dr. McGlynn has begun to grow resentful, and is telling some things that he knows about Romish affairs. In an interview, June 23, he said:-SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.14

"The people may know, what I can tell them on the highest authority: The Roman machine is to-day most anxious to have a minister of the Pope accredited to, and received by, the Government at Washington. Such minister would be an archbishop and one of the Italian ring, in whose hands it is the Roman policy to keep the power. His presence there could not fail to be a fruitful source of corruption and enslavement for the Catholic Church in this country. The Pope is also trying to have diplomatic relations with Queen Victoria, in order, as he is alleged, 'to be able to get accurate information about Irish affairs.'"SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.15

We have not the least doubt that this is the exact truth.Nor have we the least doubt that the Pope, under cover of the Irish question, will yet succeed in establishing diplomatic relations with England. Nor have we *much* doubt that the Papacy will yet have an accredited minister at the capital at Washington. When the Papacy shall have been recognized as a sovereign power by all the powers of Europe, and thus becomes a personal factor in all the affairs of European States, exceedingly plausible reasons can be produced to show that this Government ought to receive an accredited ambassador from one of the chief sovereign powers of the world. It might well be counted the height of presumption for the Government of the United States to refuse recognition to a sovereign power that was recognized as such by all the world besides. These arguments would be exceedingly convincing to politicians, when backed by the solid Catholic vote of the nation.SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.16

As for these "one hundred thousand Catholics," what does Rome care for them so long as she receives official recognition, and is courted by Governments and nations? She knows that this, being entirely political, will soon blow over. Besides, she is playing for larger stakes than anything that is involved in the question of disobedience of a mere priest. And with the accumulated experience of centuries she knows she holds the winning hand, and she, above all others, knows how to play it. The secret of Rome's consummate power is that she looks not at things in the narrow view of parties and administrations, but in the broad view of nations and ages.SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.17

"Trusting a False Guide" The Signs of the Times, 13, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent number of a religious weekly we find the following:-SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.18

"Think how Abraham received his message in Chaldea. Little by little his mind opened to the truth. Day after day he became more certain of divine help. By and by, clear and sweet as an audible voice, came the words into his soul, 'I will bless thee,' and 'thou shalt be a blessing.' The Holy Spirit will bring the words of Jesus so close that you know they were sent from God to you."SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.19

This paragraph occurred in the course of an article designed to teach that we should recognize God in our every-day life. The real effect of such things is, however, to induce people to take their own imaginings for the voice of God. We have seen of late a strong tendency toward eliminating the supernatural from the Bible, and bringing everything down to the human level. The "new school" will have it that God did not speak to Abraham with an audible voice, but that when the Bible says that God spoke to Abraham, it means that he had an overpowering impulse from within, to do a certain thing. We cannot expect such people to be logical, but if they were, they would necessarily have to explain the command to offer Isaac, and the subsequent call to Abraham not to harm the lad, as meaning that Abraham felt an uncontrollable impulse to kill Isaac, which, when he had the knife in his hand, suddenly passed away. The great trouble with such interpretation is not alone that it robs the Bible narrative of all sense and consistency, but that it teaches people to follow the insane promptings of their own hearts. It teaches that the voice of God is simply a strong impression, and is thus identical with the Spiritualist teaching that "truth is the voice of God speaking through the human soul." And all such teaching, if believed, as it surely will be, can result in nothing else but moral anarchy and corruption. We may never hear the voice of God as did Abraham, and there is no need that we should, for God's will is fully revealed in his word, and we are to follow that; and not feelings and impressions. That alone can make us wise unto salvation. It is as true now as it ever was, that "he that trusteth in his own heart is a fool."SITI July 7, 1887, page 416.20

July 14, 1887

"The Growth of Evil" The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

There is a growing tendency towards the belief that evil is a necessary thing in this world. This is a fundamental principle in the creed of Spiritualists, and it is gaining ground exactly in proportion to the growth of Spiritualism. Spiritualism professes to be a religion of nature, and sin being natural, it is very evident that the idea that sin is necessary will very easily find a multitude of adherents. The very fact that Spiritualism makes such a claim is sufficient evidence that, despite its pretension to elevate the race to the love of the pure and the beautiful, it can only result in the total degradation of the race; for let men once be assured that evil is in even the slightest degree necessary in this world, and they will be sure to make no efforts to get rid of a thing which is so pleasing to them. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.1*

A few Sundays ago, Professor Fiske, of Harvard University, lectured before the Unitarian Society of San Francisco. His address was on the nature and origin of evil. Following is a portion of the newspaper report of the address:-*SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.2*

"Mr. Fiske then went into a discussion of considerable length to establish the relativity of all knowledge. We know nothing, he said, except by contrast with or relation to something else. If there were only one color in the world, we would be unable to conceive the idea of color at all. If everything were as sweet as sugar, we would not know what taste means. In the same way, evil exists only by contrast-the contrast of a lesser good with a greater. Evil may be defined as a low stage of existence looked at from a higher one. There is ground for the hope that evil may be evanescent in the universe, but it now exists as a necessary condition of the development of man, like the relation of the shadow to the light. Were there no evil in the world, there could be no morality-no man in the highest sense; human beings would be so many puppets, but such a thing as character would be impossible." *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.3*

With all due respect for the learned Professor, we can think of nothing else, as we read his words, but the apostle's description of the downward progress of enlightened men toward heathenism: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves; who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen." *Romans 1:22-25. SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.4*

Such teaching as that of Professor Fiske is identical with that which sunk the ancient world into the most licentious idolatry, and it cannot fail to have the same effect now if it is but followed. Our boasted superior enlightenment will be no bar whatever to such a result; for, in spite of our boasting, the ancients were wiser than we, and it was, in fact, their boasted wisdom which led them into such folly and degradation. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.5*

Take now the statement that evil is necessary, and that without it there can be no morality. Can anyone fail to see that this makes the goodness of God dependent upon evil, and actually denies his absolute goodness? and that this is simply to deny his existence as God, and to degrade him to a level with man? This is identical with what Paul said: "They changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." And when men have done that, the changing of it still further into an image like to fourfooted beasts and creeping things, and giving of themselves up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, is only a question of time, and not a very long time, either. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.6*

The Professor thinks there is ground for hoping that evil may be evanescent; but what necessity is there for such a hope, or what incentive to induce man to eradicate it in himself, if evil is only a lesser good, and consequently no evil at all? Indeed, if it were true that evil is a necessary condition without which there could be no morality, then it would follow that evil ought not to be evanescent; for no matter to what heights of morality man had attained, we would begin to degenerate as soon as the evil was removed! Is it possible to conceive of a more absurd proposition? Yet in spite of its absurdity, it is seriously advanced by men who have committed to them the task of educating the youth of our land. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.7*

This theory is simply another way of expressing the idea that "whatever is right;" that man can do no wrong, for really there is no wrong. So, then, whatever a man may do, it is only a necessary step in his development. This is a pleasing thought to the carnal heart, and one that will find adherents without much urging. Now when it is remembered that "the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked," and that "from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness" (and these statements may be

verified by anyone who knows much of his own heart), it is easy to see how those who think that all the impulses of their nature are only undeveloped good, could plunge into any excess. Public sentiment may act as a restraint upon a man with such an idea; but when the public sentiment is the same, when the majority of people conclude that nothing that they want to do is evil, then there will be no restraint, and the floods of iniquity will cover the earth. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.8*

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God." *2 Timothy 3:1-4*. It now requires no prophet's eye to see this state of things just ahead. When men occupying the highest positions as moulders of the thought of the rising generation, can without rebuke give utterance to sentiments that directly lead to unrestrained vice, it is surely time for an alarm to be sounded. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.9*

"But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." *1 Timothy 6:11, 12. W.SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.10*

"The Sure Word" The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." *2 Peter 1:19. SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.11*

The apostle is not comparing one prophecy with another, but he is comparing prophecy with something else. He does not say that we have one word of prophecy that is "more sure" than some other word, but that the word of prophecy is more sure than some other thing. What that other thing is we may learn from the context. In *verses 16-18* he speaks of the certainty of Christ's coming, and the reason why he is so certain in regard to it. He says: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." The idea is this: At the transfiguration the apostles saw Christ just as he will appear when he comes in his glory. They also heard the voice of God from Heaven. So when they declared the coming of Christ, they did it on the evidence of both their eyes and their ears. This is accounted the best possible evidence; but Peter says that there is something that is more sure than this. What is it? It is the "sure word of prophecy." It is possible that a person's eyes or ears might deceive him, but there is no possibility of doubt in regard to the prophecy. And why not? Because it did not come "by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The prophecy, therefore, is as reliable as God himself. There are very few things in this life upon which we can depend implicitly; how gladly, then, we ought to receive this sure word, and how eagerly we ought to search it. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.12*

THE OBJECT OF PROPHECY

As noted by Peter, the object of the sure word of prophecy is that we may be more certain in regard to Christ's coming, for that is the grand event to which all prophecy points. Christ's first advent was the basis of many prophecies, and it was the most momentous event since the creation of the world. Upon that coming the redemption of the whole human race depended; but even that with its attendant sacrifice would be lost to us if Christ were not to come the second time. Christ came and died that man might be redeemed, to reign with him forever; but those whom he has purchased cannot be with him unless, according to his promise, he comes again to redeem them to himself. There is no other way by which we can go to Heaven. So the redemption of the race depends fully as much upon Christ's second coming as upon the first. It is no wonder, then, that so much prophecy has been given in regard to so important an event. We will examine a little of it, and we shall see that the coming of our Lord is not so vague and indefinite a matter as some would have us believe. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.13*

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM

This dream, related in the second chapter of Daniel, is familiar to every reader of the Bible. The circumstances attending it are such as would attract the attention of one who was reading merely for pleasure, for they are highly interesting. But our interest in the narrative is increased a thousand-fold when we learn the object and interpretation of the dream. The object of the dream is told in few words. Daniel said to the king, "There is a

God in Heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar *what shall be in the latter days.*" Then it is for us far more than for Nebuchadnezzar. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.14*

The dream was as follows: A great image, bright in appearance and terrible in form, appeared to the king. Its head was of fine gold, its breast and arms and its feet of mingled clay and iron. While the king looked upon this image, a stone was cut out of the mountain without the aid of human hands. This stone smote the image upon the feet, and instantly the whole image was reduced to fine powder, and was blown away; but the stone immediately became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.15*

The interpretation of the dream occupies but little more space. Daniel, after reminding the king that God has given him universal dominion, tells him that his kingdom is symbolized by the head of gold. The other three divisions of the image, the silver, the brass, and the iron, symbolize three other universal empires. The last one of these is to be divided into ten parts, as is indicated by the ten toes of the image, which shall be distinct from each other. And now comes the closing scene: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall *stand for ever*. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king *what shall come to pass hereafter*: and the dream is certain, and *the interpretation thereof sure.*" *Daniel 2:44, 45. SITI July 14, 1887, page 422.16*

This dream with its interpretation was not given that men might be informed in regard to earthly kingdoms, but for the sole purpose of pointing out the fifth universal kingdom. Then we may know something in regard to the time of its setting up. Let us follow the connection. Babylon was conquered by the Medes and Persians, B.C. 538. Medo-Persia, then, was the empire symbolized by the breast and arms of silver. The Persian Empire in its turn gave away to the Greeks. This took place B.C. 321. Here we have three of the four kingdoms; and since there were to be but four universal, earthly monarchies, the fourth cannot be difficult to locate. There is no doubt but that Rome was symbolized by the iron part of the image. It was at the height of its power at the first advent of Christ, having fully completed the conquest of Greece half a century before. There is no disputing the fact that it was universal in its dominion, and Scripture proof of the fact is found in *Luke 2:1*. Now we have the four universal empires before us. Where shall we look for the setting up of the fifth. In the days of Christ? No; because Rome was then undivided. It could not be set up until the division of that empire into its ten parts, which was completed A.D. 457. The coming of Christ, and the setting up of his everlasting kingdom, is the next thing brought to our view. And this is in reality the next thing to be accomplished. Certain things must be done by powers that now exist, but when earthly governments again fall, their place will be taken by Christ's kingdom. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 423.1*

Now is not this a sure word of prophecy? Kingdoms have risen and fallen just as predicted by the prophet. He said that the ten divisions of the Roman Empire would seek to consolidate their power, but would be unsuccessful, and so it has been. Every attempt to unite the nations of Europe has ended in failure. And if the past has been fulfilled to the letter, we have the assurance that that which yet remains will as surely be fulfilled. Inspiration did not point out the length of time that these earthly kingdoms should exist, and it has not told when the heavenly kingdom will be set up, but we know it cannot be far distant. The divided state of the image has continued for 1,400 years, much longer than any other division. Other prophecies show more definitely that the end is very near. We learn from this that God's kingdom is as much a reality as any earthly kingdom, and that those whose interest is in earthly things can have no part in it. Are we fitting ourselves for citizenship in that glorious, everlasting kingdom? W. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 423.2*

"Life and Death Everlasting" The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

When we read the words of the Lord concerning the wicked, "For the Lord God of hosts shall make a consumption, even determined, in the midst of all the land;" "for yet a little while, and the indignation shall cease, and mine anger in their destruction" (*Isaiah 10:23, 25*), and say that the Lord never designed to keep the wicked alive to all eternity suffering torture, we are told that if we limit the suffering of the wicked we have no assurance that the righteous will have everlasting happiness. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 423.3*

This idea is based upon the erroneous idea of what is to constitute the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. It is true that the wicked are to suffer torment, and the righteous to have fullness of joy evermore at the right hand of God; but neither of these constitute the reward promised to the two classes. All that is promised to the righteous is life. Said Christ, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." *John 10:10*. "Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." *John 5:10*. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." *John 3:16*. "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus." *2 Timothy 1:1. SITI July 14, 1887, page 423.4*

To the wicked, death is threatened, "The wages of sin is death." *Romans 6:23*. "But the fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; *which is the second death.*" *Revelation 21:8*. "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live." *Deuteronomy 30:19*. "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." *Romans 8:13*. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 423.5*

We find that everywhere the choice is between life and death. The reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked are exactly opposite. As we said, all that is primarily promised to the righteous is life, but that comprehends everything else. The man who has unlimited life may have all things. Then, too, that promised life is really *life*. It is not partial life, as is our short life, but perfect life in every organ, so that there will be no sickness to interfere with plans. Therefore we say that this promise of life comprehends all blessings that may be desired. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 424.1*

But how long will it last? To all eternity, for the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. "But," says one, "you limit the punishment of the wicked, which the Bible declares will be eternal, and why may you not as well limit the reward of the righteous?" That is a mistake; we do not put a limit to the punishment of the wicked. It will be everlasting, that is, without end. It will be just as long as the reward of the righteous. "These [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." *Matthew 25:46*. But this does not say that the wicked shall be in eternal *torment*. As we have seen, the punishment of the wicked is not primarily suffering, but it is death. They will suffer torment, and doubtless for a very long time, but until death shall have ensued they will not have received their punishment. Since their punishment is death, and it is also eternal, it follows that the punishment of the wicked is eternal death. And this agrees exactly with the words of Paul, who says that they "shall be punished with *everlasting destruction.*" *2 Thessalonians 1:9*. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 424.2*

There is no life except in Christ. The righteous have the promise of life which is in Christ. Their life is hid with Christ in God. And when they, in common with all men, are redeemed from the death which came upon them as the result of their inherited mortality, they will live as long as Christ does. The wicked, however, after having their mortal life restored to them, shall be punished with death for the sins which they have committed, and when they go down to the grave the second time there is no way by which they can be rescued, and they "sleep a perpetual sleep." *W. SITI July 14, 1887, page 424.3*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

The last Australian steamer brought meager news from the laborers there, owing to the fact that it sailed a little sooner than was expected. A brief note from Elder Daniels states that the church in Auckland now occupy their own house of worship, and that a missionary society of forty members has been organized. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.1*

Subscriptions to the *American Sentinel* are now coming in a way to delight the hearts, not only of the publishers, but of all who believe that the *Sentinel* has an important work to do. Every mail brings in scores, and some hundreds of subscriptions. That it does occupy a position second to none in importance is conceded by all who are awake to the issues of the day. Let its friends rally to its support. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.2*

One of the main points in a recent address delivered by George W. Cable, in Nashville, Tenn., was that "the ideal government must be by a minority, elected by the majority, whose will is to be appealed to frequently, administered in harmony with the higher law of God." Of course it is understood that the majority are to decide what is in harmony with that higher law of God; and there you have National Reform governments in a nutshell. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.3*

The *Truth Seeker*, which is the inappropriate name of the chief infidel organ in this country, has a correspondent who has been studying Spiritualism in Boston. As the result of his investigations he reports that all the Spiritualists are infidels, but that not all infidels are Spiritualistic. He is undoubtedly correct, but if he should make his investigations a few years from now he would have to change the last part of his report, for all the infidels will then be Spiritualists. But they will still be infidels. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.4*

Quite a stir has been made of late over the charge that Canon Fleming, of the Church of England, had appropriated one of Dr. Talmage's sermons, and had preached it as his own. The Canon now admits the deed, and confesses that he was guilty of an "inadvertence." This is the latest euphemism for stealing. What with "defalcations," "shortages," "failures," "appropriations," "inadvertances," etc., we shall soon have no such

thing as stealing. Then will all the world be honest! But it will be honesty that will correspond to the chastity of the ancient Spartans, among whom, we are told, it was impossible to find an adulterer, and that they knew not what the name adultery meant. This, however, was solely because what is now universally known as adultery was exceedingly common, and was sanctioned by law. This seeking to relieve a thing of the odium attached to it, by changing its name, is indirectly encouraged by those who think to avoid the imputation of breaking the fourth commandment calling the first day of the week the seventh. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.5*

The tithe question is making no small stir in Wales. The case stands thus: The Church of England being a State church, derives its income from the country, just the same as the general Government. The tithe is the tax which the church imposes for the support of its ministers. Now many of the farmers of Wales are dissenters, and while they may be willing to give even more than a tithe for the support of the gospel, they do not wish to be forced to pay, nor to pay tithe at all for a religious establishment with which they have no sympathy. Accordingly the English Government proceeds to sell their property for delinquent church taxes, and the farmers rebel. The same thing would be done in this country if the National Reformers had their scheme in running order. Everybody, Jew, Gentile, and Christian, would be *compelled* to pay for the support of the ministers of the State religion, just as they now have to pay for the support of the civil Government which protects them, no man ought to be *compelled* to contribute for the support of any religion. And the injustice is increased when the support is demanded of one who is not in sympathy with the ecclesiastical establishment. But justice in any particular is not to be expected when religion is made a matter of politics. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.6*

"To What Profit?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

Speaking of the study of the Sunday-school scholars and teachers, during the past six months, the *Congregationalist* says:-*SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.7*

"We doubt if the Old Testament has ever been studied with more eager interest, or with greater profit and delight." *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.8*

And yet the lesson for June 5, on the falling of the manna, a copy of which now lies before us, has the following questions and answers, exactly as we here insert them:-*SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.9*

Question—"How often did they gather it?" *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.10*

Answer—"Every day except Sunday." *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.11*

Q.—"Could they keep it overnight?" *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.12*

A.—"Only Saturday nights." *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.13*

Q.—"Why was this?" *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.14*

A.—"So they need not break the Sabbath." *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.15*

So ho! The children of Israel kept Sunday for Sabbath did they? We know that there has never been a more "eager interest" to make out that Sunday is the Sabbath than there is now, and it may have been a source of great "delight" for the lesson writers to corrupt the word of God that it might be made to appear so to the Sunday-school scholars; but when the day of reckoning comes, we think that they will not find it so profitable as they now imagine it to be. With what eager interest indeed the Scriptures must have been studied, especially by those who wrote the lesson helps, to learn from it no better than to teach that the manna did not fall on Sunday, and that it would keep only on Saturday night. It is hard to see how the writers of these lessons can escape the just imputation of turning the truth of God into a lie. For how else shall the shameful thing be characterized? If that is not the proper charge, we wish somebody would tell what would be proper in the premises. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.16*

"Only the Living Give" The Signs of the Times, 13, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

Among the resolutions adopted at the recent meeting of the American Home Mission Society, was the following:-*SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.17*

"That legacies shall be appropriated and expended the year after their receipt, to the end that the society shall always have on hand some resources commensurate with its ever-enlarging work. We urge especially in this

transition period, a great increase in the gifts of the living." *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.18*

The last sentence is the one that particularly caught our attention. When we read the plea for an increase in "the gifts of the living," the thought instantly arose, Who else but the living ever give anything? Careful thought has not enabled us to find any other givers. "But," says one, "you seem to forget the great legacies that have been left by people who are dead." No, we do not forget the legacies, but they are not given. That word "left" expresses the situation exactly. No matter how much a man has, he *leaves* it all when he dies. But how much credit is a man entitled to for leaving that which he cannot by any possibility carry with him? When a man gives of his means as he goes along, we know that he has an interest in something besides himself; but when a man with large wealth clings to it just as long as he possibly can, is it altogether uncharitable to suppose that if it were possible he would cling to it after death? *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.19*

No matter how benevolent a person may have been in his life-time, we still insist that he does not in any just sense *give* that which he *leaves*. He may indicate in his will that he wishes a certain institution to have that which he leaves, but if the institution gets it, it is only after a severe struggle. So in reality his "giving" amounts to this statement: "This money is of no more use to me, and you may have it if you can get it." The moral is, If you want to give, and thus lay up treasure in Heaven, don't wait until you die, when you cannot give. *SITI July 14, 1887, page 432.20*

July 21, 1887

"Our Senses Not Infallible" The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

In speaking and writing on the subject of Spiritualism, and the lying wonders that will be manifested by it just before the end, we have often said that in order to stand firm during that trying time, one must have such an implicit, fixed faith in the Bible that he will trust it rather than his senses, and even against the evidence of his senses. A recent published statement to this effect was noted in a leading Spiritualist journal, with the request that we should tell "for what purpose our senses are given us." This we shall endeavor briefly to do, negatively at least, not especially for the benefit of the questioner, but for thousands of others, who may not be in the snare, but who may be in danger of it through their too great confidence in their own sensations. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.1*

It requires not much thought to convince one that he can know very little by his unaided senses. For instance, our senses would tell us that the earth is stationary, and that it is the sun and moon that move. There is not a sense, even allowing that we have seven instead of five, by which we could tell that the sun does not actually sink into the ocean at night, and in some mysterious way slip around to the east in time to start the next morning on another trip overland. The native Indians have the sense of sight and of hearing far more acutely developed than we have, yet they have never discovered the rotation of the earth. Once, we are told, the question was discussed in a certain tribe that had heard the new-fangled notion from a white man. An old Indian philosopher took steps to settle the question effectually. He drove a stake into the ground, and then placed a round stone on top. In the morning the stone was found in its place on the top of the stake, and the whole tribe knew at once that there was nothing to the white man's notion that the earth revolves, for if it did, would not the stone have fallen from the stake during the night? *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.2*

We repeat: The senses of savages are far more acute than those of others, yet a knowledge of the movements of the heavenly bodies exists only among civilized nations. Why is this? The skeptic will no doubt laugh at our reply, but we have not the slightest doubt that it is because civilized nations have the influence of the Bible. It is because of the direct or indirect influence of the Bible that nations are civilized, even though they may not acknowledge this influence. We can trace the increase of knowledge right along with the increased circulation of the Bible. In the Dark Ages, when the Bible was almost unknown, scientific knowledge was at a low ebb, yet may hundreds of years before, a book had been written, which said: "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." *Job 26:7*. And the same writer said that the winds have weight. *Job 28:25*. Where did he get his knowledge? From God. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.3*

We are not claiming for the Bible that it is in the popular sense a scientific book. That is, it is not designed as a text-book on philosophy; it was written for a different purpose. But we do claim that it is scientifically correct, and that it is the foundation of all knowledge. It is only the literal truth when the Bible says: "Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding." Without stopping to dwell on this point, we will simply say that, notwithstanding the infidel taunts that Christianity has done nothing for science, the men who have added the most to our store of real knowledge, as Newton and Kepler, were devout Christians, and the vague hypotheses and groundless assumptions that have had to be abandoned, were devised by men who scouted the Bible. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.4*

Our senses are not infallible. "Optical illusions" are among the most common occurrences. The moon has a fixed, unvarying size, yet there are probably no two persons to whom it has exactly the same appearance. One will say that it looks as large around as a cart-wheel, while another will say that it looks no larger than the bottom of a quart cup. Of a dozen persons who hear a statement, scarcely any two will repeat it exactly alike. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.5*

Yet it will be said, and truly too, that we cannot perceive anything except through some one or all of our senses. It is only by means of our senses, after all, that we are able to realize the fact that the earth is round, and that it revolves on its axis and moves through space. But let it be remembered that this knowledge comes to us only after our senses are educated; and faith is the prime agent in this education. We may say that we use our reason in determining the truthfulness of any statement that is made to us; but we have to accept certain things on trust as a basis for our reasoning. Certain things must be accepted simply on the authority of the one who tells them to us, before we can have any starting-point for our reason. The science of mathematics, which calls for the exercise of pure reason, depends upon certain principles which the child must take upon trust. And the whole of our knowledge of nature depends upon faith. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." *Hebrews 11:3. SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.6*

Now we come to the phenomena of Spiritualism, and we will take the phenomena of materialization, which is the *we plus ultra* in the "proof" of Spiritualism. There are only three senses available in testing the claims of this phenomena, -seeing, hearing, and feeling. By these it may be ascertained that the spirits that appear are real beings. But this does not settle the case at all, for we do not question the fact that real beings do appear, and will appear more frequently as the end approaches. The real question is, Are these beings what they profess to be, -the spirits of men who have once lived on this earth? The only help that one can get from his senses in determining this point is through looking at them and hearing their testimony. As to the first, we know that cases of mistaken identity are very common, and that it is possible for a man to so disguise himself as to deceive his most intimate friends, making them think that he is somebody else; or, on the other hand, a stranger may so change his appearance as to impose on people, and make them believe that he is some one of their acquaintances. This being the case, it is evident that seeing the appearance of one's dead friend is by no means positive evidence that it is indeed that friend. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.7*

If it is said that the spirits tell things that were known only to the hearer and the departed friend, that is easily explained by the Bible doctrine that "they are the spirits of devils." Once allowing that there are angels, both good and bad, who are of a higher order of creation than man, and who are invisible to our natural sight, and the conclusion is necessary that they must know many things that we do or say when we think we are unseen and unheard. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.8*

Then we come to the testimony of the spirits themselves. We may hear them say that they are indeed our friends who have been long dead. But this appeal is not to our senses but to our trust in their word. They say that they are the spirits of dead men, and the Bible says that they are the spirits of devils. So it is simply a question of evidence, and we must decide as to which is the more reliable. But Spiritualists themselves admit that the testimony of the spirits is unreliable. The editor of the *Golden Gate* says:-*SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.9*

"Whoever surrenders his individual judgment, and places his trust implicitly upon the communications of spirits, as given through promiscuous mediumship, is almost certain to be deceived. It matters not how confiding his trust, or implicit his faith, nor how sincere or honest he may be in his intentions, he will find the average spiritual message a broken reed, if he attempt to lean upon it to the exclusion of the staff of his own reason." *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.10*

Again, in his issue of May 6, 1886, he gave a *fae simile* of some slate writing done by the spirits, and in commenting upon it he said:-*SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.11*

"It is not claimed that this writing was done, in all instances, or even in any instance, by the spirit giving the name. Much of it, no doubt, is done by the medium's control, or by spirits skilled in the manipulation of the pencil tips; and such spirits act as mediums for those less proficient in the matter. This explains the poor grammar and orthography sometimes witnessed in communications from spirits who, in earth life, we know would never have committed such mistakes." *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.12*

That is to say that the awkward language in a communication received from Webster is due to the acknowledged fact that Webster never wrote it! A very good reason. But when it is admitted by Spiritualists themselves, that communications from the spirits are untrustworthy, the last plea for the evidence of our senses in determining their character, is voluntarily withdrawn. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.13*

In contrast with the confessedly false testimony of the spirits, we have the testimony of the Bible, which is not yea, and nay, but yea and amen. It is always consistent with itself, which is one of the highest evidences of truth. That book assures us that "the dead know not anything" (*Ecclesiastes 9:5*) for when "his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth," and "in that very day his thoughts perish." *Psalms 146:4*. We are told that "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence," (*Psalms 115:17*); that "his sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them" (*Job 24:21*); and that "neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." *Ecclesiastes 9:6*. It also tells us that these wondrous miracles that are alleged to be performed by departed spirits of men, are the work of "the spirits of devils" (*Revelation 16:14*); and this tallies exactly with the Spiritualist's statement that the spirits are untrustworthy; for the devil is a liar and the father of it; it is his nature to lie. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.14*

Therefore we repeat that when the devil shall come down "with great power, knowing that he hath but a short time," and shall work "with all power, and signs, and lying wonders," the only safeguard any person will have will be his faith in the sure testimony of the Bible. Our senses will be appealed to, to bear witness of the reality of these miracles, and so far as the senses themselves can determine, the spirits will be what they profess to be; but we must remember that our senses may be deceived, and can therefore do nothing but distrust their evidence, and depend on that higher evidence-implicit faith in God's word. Happy will it be for those who are now trusting that word so implicitly, and testing it so fully by a practical application of its teachings to their

lives, that when that trying time comes they will turn to it as the most natural thing to do, and will meet every attempt at deception with the words, "It is written." W. SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.15

"Baptized for the Dead" The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

"If Christ did not preach to the spirits of the dead in prison, as explained in Vol. 13, No. 17, and the dead are unconscious, then what does 1 Corinthians 15:29 mean? E. J. G." SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.16

That text reads as follows: "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" We do not know what view our friend has of this; but if he thinks it has any bearing whatever on the condition of man in death, he must believe in the theory of a probation after death. We will not take the space here to again show the fallacy of that theory, but will give the simplest exposition of the text in question. SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.17

The whole chapter is a defense of the doctrine of the resurrection. The apostle has nothing directly to say of the condition of man in death, for that is unnecessary; the very fact that he is demonstrating the truth of the resurrection, shows that he regarded the dead as unconscious. For if the dead were to be unconscious—that is, if they were not really dead—there would be no necessity for a resurrection. Incidentally, however, the apostle shows the condition of the dead when he says that if there be no resurrection, "then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." That is to say that the promised resurrection is all that stands between the dead in Christ and eternal extinction. SITI July 21, 1887, page 438.18

Christian baptism is an act expressive of faith in the death and resurrection of Christ. See Romans 6:3-14. It is also an act representative of faith in the future resurrection, for the resurrection of Christ was a pledge of the general resurrection. He says, "Because I live, ye shall live also." So when a person is baptized he shows (1) his belief that he is a sinner under sentence of death; (2) his acceptance of the condemnation as just; (3) his belief that Christ "was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification;" and (4) that by being thus baptized into Christ's death, and rising to walk in newness of life, he will finally have a resurrection from the dead, and will live with Christ. Paul's argument is evidently addressed to those who professed Christianity, and who believed in baptism, but who questioned the doctrine of the resurrection. To such he shows the inconsistency of their position, by proving that if there be no resurrection, Christ is not raised, and if Christ be not raised, those who are fallen asleep in Christ are perished; and since if they are baptized it is only into a dead Christ, their being baptized amounts to nothing, since baptism derives all its force from the resurrection. SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.1

"Virtue at a Discount" The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

There is nothing that can equal the certainty of some people, concerning things that have never been revealed, unless it is their condition of blissful uncertainty concerning things that are clearly set forth in the sacred word. For instance, notwithstanding the plain wording of the fourth commandment, it is a rare thing to find one who knows that the seventh day of the week, Saturday, is the Sabbath of the Lord, and ought to be kept holy, while the same ones who express so much doubt on this point, are very sure that any man who has died in the belief that the soul is immortal, has gone to Heaven. SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.2

An instance of the positiveness is given in a matter-of-course way in the Congregationalist account of the closing exercises of Andover Theological Seminary. After the professors had completed their work of examination on the subject of eschatology, the board of visitors began their catechizing thus: "Are Socrates and Plato in Heaven?" And the reply came back promptly, "Yes, sir." SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.3

Unfortunately we are not told why Socrates and Plato are so undoubtedly enjoying the bliss of the saved, so we must examine their character for ourselves. Socrates wrote nothing, and about all we know of his teaching is what we learn from Plato, who was his echo. One or two statements, however, will throw a little light on his character. In the first chapter of his "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures," Dr. Horne, speaking of the ancient heathen philosophers, says: SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.4

"Truth was but of small account among many, even of the best heathen; for they taught that on many occasion a lie was to be preferred to the truth itself! To which we may add that the unlimited gratification of their sensual appetites, and the commission of unnatural crimes, was common even among the most distinguished teachers of philosophy, and was practiced even by Socrates himself... 'The most notorious vices,' says Quintilian, speaking of the philosophers of his time, 'are screened under that name;' and they do not labor to maintain the character of philosophers by virtue and study, but conceal the most vicious lives

under an austere look and singularity of dress." *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.5*

It is a well-known fact that Socrates had a *dream*, or familiar spirit, from whom he derived all his knowledge, and upon whose counsel he depended for direction in the affairs of life. In other words, Socrates was a Spiritualist, and his life was perfectly in accord with the teachings of Spiritualism when they are carried out to the fullest length. We have the authority of Potter's "Antiquities of Greece" for the statement that "it was frequent in some parts of Greece to borrow one another's wives. At Athens, Socrates lent his wife Xantippe to Aleibiades." *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.6*

Of Plato's morals we learn an abundance from his own teachings. He it was who formulated the pernicious doctrine that was held in principle by all heathen, and is a cardinal doctrine of modern Spiritualism, that man is the sole judge of his own actions; that truth is inherent in the human soul, or, in other words, that man himself is God. Consistently with a doctrine which opens the way for the fullest gratification of one's passions, we find that Plato advocated community of women, and the education of them the same as men, and together with them, even so far as exercising together in the gymnasium naked. He also advocated perjury in matters of love, advocated also that "on an expedition soldiers should be allowed unbounded license both with respect to women and boys, as by this means they will be more inflamed to gain the victory." He himself was no more austere in his personal life than was his master, Socrates, and made no secret of his association with prostitutes. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.7*

Yet these are the men whom modern theology unhesitatingly grants a place in Heaven, thus anticipating the sentence of God, the Judge of all. And why do they do this? Solely because to them the Christian church owes the doctrine of the inherent immortality of the soul. All their vice and immoral teachings are condoned, and they are translated to the third Heaven simply because they taught that the soul was immortal. Surely such teaching places virtue at a discount, and really puts a premium upon vice. Nowadays when a man dies, no matter if he had been perfectly indifferent concerning religion, if it can be remembered by anyone that he ever expressed a belief in the immortality of the soul, he is at once set down as undoubtedly a Christian, although his belief in immortality had no connection whatever with Christ. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.8*

Socrates and Plato are accounted as saved because they taught the doctrine of the inherent immortality of the soul. Now it is susceptible of the clearest proof that their immortality, which would most surely shut them out of Heaven (*Ephesians 5:5*) unless they repent, of which there is not the slightest evidence, was the direct result of their belief in the immortality of the soul. Here is the proof:—*SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.9*

The apostle Paul tells us that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." *Romans 14:23*. Now their belief in immortality was not based upon faith at all. It was based solely on self-conceit and egotism. They had so exalted an idea of their own attainments, and of the powers of their own mind, that they could not conceive of anything in the universe greater than man. They thought that the mind of man was "lord of itself and of all the world beside;" and that all knowledge was inherent in the human soul. Thus while they professed belief in the gods, and even in one supreme God, they had no higher conception of God than that he was like themselves (*Psalms 50:21*); for they thought that they themselves were part of God, and their gods were dead men. But if knowledge was inherent in the human soul, it must be, they reasoned, the latent knowledge that was acquired in some anterior state of being; and if man was a part of God, he must be immortal; that is, mind being supreme could have neither beginning nor end. Thus their belief in the supremacy of the mind of man was inseparable from their belief in the immortality of the soul; the two were one. But their exaltation of the human mind led them into the grossest licentiousness, for they thought that whatever the mind conceived must be right and proper. Thus "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." They had faith only in themselves, and that was, of course, no faith at all; and this self-exaltation led them into sin. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.10*

At some future time we shall show, what is here implied, that all the evil that has cursed this earth sprung from the teaching of the immortality of the soul. We are aware that some will regard such language as almost blasphemy, but they will change their minds when they study the subject from the Bible standpoint. Let no one think that we are not believers in immortality. We believe that Christ "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel," and that all who truly believe in Christ will be clothed with immortality when he comes. We believe in immortality that is received through faith, which exalts Christ, and not in immortality which a man has without faith, which exalts man and ignores Christ. A belief in immortality through Christ, is Christianity; a belief in immortality without Christ, is paganism, even though it be taught in a professedly Christian theological seminary. W. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.11*

"The Gospel of the Kingdom, and the End" The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

"Our Saviour taught us, in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, that the gospel should be preached in all the

world, and then the end would come. How is it that the gospel was preached to every creature under heaven in Paul's day (*Colossians 1:23*) and the end is not yet? Please explain. A.J." *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.12*

We think that the explanation may be found in a portion of *Matthew 24:41* which our correspondent did not quote, and in the context of the same passage. The text reads: "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." "This gospel of the kingdom" can be nothing else than that of the preaching of the coming of our Lord in his kingdom. Now while it is true that Paul and the other apostles taught that Christ would come again, they did not set his coming forth as an event immediately to take place, but on the contrary warned the people against the idea that his coming was immediately at hand. Knowing, as the apostles did, that the day of the Lord could not come until after the great apostasy, and the revealing of "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," the Papacy, it is not possible that they should preach "this gospel of the kingdom," just as it must be preached when the kingdom is about to be set up. They taught the people to look forward to it as being the grand consummation of all their hopes, but they did not teach them to expect it in their day. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.13*

But the explanation is found chiefly in the context of *Matthew 24:14*, which shows when that passage applies. In this and the preceding verses of the chapter, beginning with the fourth, Jesus has given a brief answer to the question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" It is very evident that *verses 4-11* cover in brief the same ground that is covered in *verses 21-47*. "For nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom." *Verse 7*. This did not take place in Paul's day, nor for many years after. In Paul's day the Roman Empire was a unity, and there was no general uprising such as is indicated in this verse. The reference is unmistakably to the conflicts of nations and kingdoms which resulted in the overthrow of the great Roman Empire, and the establishment of the Papacy, which was but the beginning of sorrows. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.14*

This conclusion is verified by *verses 9, 10*: "Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you; and ye shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. And then shall many be offended, and shall betray one another, and shall hate one another." After the rising up of nations and kingdoms, and the establishment of the Papacy, which was the beginning of sorrows (*verse 8*), came the terrible persecution, during which the saints of God were delivered up to be slain, and they were hated of all nations for the sake of Christ. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.15*

Then *verses 11-14* brings to view the terribly lax state of morality that will exist even in the professed church of God in the last days (see *2 Thessalonians 3:1-5, 12, 13*), when the love of many shall wax cold, and then comes the statement that "this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." *Verse 14*. Now it seems evident that this statement is entirely independent of the general one made by Paul. This one refers to a special time. In the days of Christ and the apostles the world had wonderful light. The gospel in its purity was carried everywhere. (See *Acts 2:8-11*.) But the great apostasy almost drove the knowledge of the gospel from the earth, and in the Dark Ages generations of men lived in darkness greater than that of many of the heathen before the time of Christ. But a reform was prophesied. The Reformation begun by Luther and others was to go on until the work of reformation should culminate in the Third Angel's Message, which should bring the gospel of the kingdom to all nations; and when all the world had received the warning message, and the whole earth had been lightened with its glory, then should the end come. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 439.16*

This prophecy has nearly reached its complete fulfillment, and the end is close at hand. And now it behooves all to heed the admonition, "Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." W. *SITI July 21, 1887, page 440.1*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

The following from the *Independent* is a very sound opinion of a widely prevalent practice. With that the advice might be followed in all the pulpits in the land:- *SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.1*

"The minister that is constantly on the lookout among current events for the topics of sensational sermons on the Sabbath, and uses his Bible mainly for texts on which to hang the sermons, is almost anything but a preacher of the gospel. He had better read his Bible more and study current events less. He will thereby better edify the church, and be the means of saving more souls." *SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.2*

Sunday evening, July 10, the eminent Baptist preacher, Dr. J. D. Fulton, of Brooklyn, N. Y., delivered an address in Oakland on "Romanism in America." It was an excellent portrayal of the encroachments of the Papacy in our country and upon our institutions. Yet we cannot see any prospect that the Doctor's remedy will prove adequate to conquer the disease-that is, to have Rome and Romanists all to turn Protestant. The

Doctor's diagnosis was most excellent, but his prescription we are confident will never prove effectual.*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.3*

The *Mirror* says that "a Catholic prayer cannot be too circumspect in dealing with unhappy differences that are liable to crop out now and then in an institution embracing men of every cast of mind and temperament." And that is a fact; for it is by no means a pleasant thing for anybody, either Catholic or Protestant, to retract honestly expressed convictions without being convinced that they are erroneous; but that is just what Catholic papers must do if in dealing with unhappy differences they chance to express opinions not entertained by the Pope or even by the bishop of the diocese in which they are published. Truly, papers which support infallibility should be both circumspect and servile; they must be the latter if they would remain Catholic; and a good degree of circumspection renders the servility much less apparent though none the less real.*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.4*

A paper recently read before a Boston missionary society speaks thus of the native Christians in the Sandwich Islands:-*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.5*

"Commercial prosperity and a misguided king have done much to increase the temptations to wrong-doing, mainly in the way of liquor-drinking, a revival of heathenish dances and official corruption, which have been fostered and even pressed on the people by the king and his ministers.... Still there are probably no people who yield more readily to good influences than the Hawaiians; ... and they are always and everywhere ready to join actively in church and Sunday-school work when it is made attractive."*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.6*

And in this respect they are not at all unlike thousands of professed Christians in more favored lands. It is a pretty hard matter to find any great number of people anywhere who are willing "to join actively in church and Sunday-school work" unless "it is made attractive." And that is why there is so much show and so little reality in the religion of the present day. The people not only in Hawaii but everywhere are "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," and that is why we have so much "church work" that simply ministers to the passions and appetites of those who are drawn into the church because religion "is made attractive."*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.7*

If all the modern devices for making the church attractive, from the oyster supper to the latest invention, the "donkey social," were once and forever banished from Christendom, there might be fewer names upon the church books, but it is pretty certain that there would be more in the Lamb's Book of Life.*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.8*

The following from the *Independent* is, we believe, strictly according to the facts in the matter. We have no doubt that much the same line of thought has occurred to almost everyone who has thought upon the subject at all. It seems that in most theological seminaries the Bible is the thing that is studied the least. And so far as we have been able to observe the evil is not corrected even when the students leave the seminaries and get into the pulpit:-*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.9*

"It has often occurred to us that our theological seminaries do not sufficiently, especially in the matter of theology, teach the theology of the Bible as the word of God. The young men are taught systematic theology, dogmatic theology, and polemic theology, but in our judgment not sufficiently taught the theology of the Word. We have been struck with this defect when they appear before councils or presbyteries, and are examined as to their qualifications for the Christian ministry. In far too many instances, indeed almost as a general rule, so far as our observation has been extended, they have been unable to give their reasons from the Bible for what they believe. Put them to the task of citing proof-texts for their opinions, and they usually show a lamentable defect in their education. They do not seem to be as familiar with the word of God as they ought to be. The language of the Scriptures does not readily occur to their lips. This proves that they have not been thoroughly trained in Biblical knowledge, which we regard as absolutely primary in all training for the gospel ministry. For this kind of knowledge there is no substitute. It is the *sine qua non*, and should take the precedence of everything else."*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.10*

Mrs. Leavitt, who is making a journey around the world in the interests of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union, sends the following word from Siam:-*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.11*

"DEAR REVEREND MISSIONARY BOARDS: Pray do not send out any more wine-bibbing, cigar-smoking missionaries; there is bad example enough in all these lands from ungodly men of Christian lands who are in Government employ and engage in business. Let Christian missionaries be so free from all these things that no poor soul or body can be injured by following their example."*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.12*

That any such should ever have been sent at all, is entirely too bad. Yet we do not see exactly how it is that a wine-bibbing, cigar-smoking missionary in Siam is any worse than is a wine-bibbing, cigar-smoking minister in America. If such do not represent Christianity there neither do they here. And how missionaries, ministers, or people can practice such things and yet think themselves Christians is something we cannot understand. It

shows an estimate of the virtue of Christ that is deplorably low.*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.13*

The Healdsburg school begins Monday, July 25. All who expect to attend this term should be there the first day if possible, much will be lost otherwise. Also remember the dedicatory services of the new meeting-house at Healdsburg, Sabbath and first-day, July 30 and 31. Meetings will commence Sabbath eve, the 29. Come to the meeting praying, and bringing the blessing of God with you.*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.14*

"Not a Godless Nation?—Why Not?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian at Work* declares of France that "the nation is not godless," and in proof of the statement adduces the fact that there was celebrated in the Paris churches "the other Sunday, the *Fête Dieu*, or God's Festival." It says:-*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.15*

"The Madeleine Church was especially decorated for the occasion and the ceremonies, closing with a procession, were performed with the scenic splendor of the Roman ritual.... The procession, as it wound along the church and descended the steps at the rear of the edifice, presented a most striking and effective picture, with the priests in gorgeous vestments, the acolytes, or altar boys, and choristers in their snowy surplices and crimson girdles, and the numerous school-children in white veils and dresses, who carried banners and pennons.... A well-dressed man who was looking on, neglected, either unintentionally or with design, to take off his hat. He was instantly set upon by a dozen persons, whose religious enthusiasm had been suddenly kindled by the music, the flowers, and the incense, and was severely beaten. He escaped, all bleeding, from their hands, and his clothes were torn almost to shreds."*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.16*

On, no! France is not godless. Neither is China, nor Hindostan, nor any other Catholic or heathen nation. And in all these lands their "godliness" and their "religious enthusiasm" find expression in about the same way. In view of this report it is a happy thing that we have the assurance of the *Christian at Work* that France "is not godless;" otherwise we might be inclined to doubt whether such actions were a manifestation of the genuine righteousness that becometh a nation. But this undoubted assurance, supported by such signal proofs, we suppose establishes once for all the important fact that France is a godly nation; which fact, with the proofs, we commend to the National Reform Association. The United States alone among nations is "godless." But in that respect may she remain forever just as she is. We have no desire to see here Popish processions or anything else that shall kindle the "enthusiasm" of violent national religionists.*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.17*

"Puritan 'Rights'" The Signs of the Times, 13, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

Rev. Geo. C. Adams, writing from St. Louis to the *Advance* about the Sunday law, says:-*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.18*

"The charge is freely made that it is an effort to make a 'Puritanical' Sunday, and so it is; for the Puritan certainly believed in equal rights for all and was not willing to allow any privileged classes."*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.19*

Yes, indeed! The Puritans of New England "certainly believed in equal rights for all" *Puritans*, but they just as certainly believed in no rights at all for anybody else, not even the right to *live*, in New England. They were indeed "not willing to allow any privileged classes" except Puritans. In them were summed up all rights and all privileges, even to the right and privilege of hanging Quakers and witches, whipping Baptists and banishing dissenters of all kinds, under pain of death. Theirs was the right to compel people to go to church on Sunday and listen to sermons such as, said one of the victims, "was meat to be digested, but only by the heart or stomach of an ostrich." Theirs was the right to be women to tie tails of carts and drag them through New England towns, at the same time lashing them upon the bare back with heavy two-handed ships made of three thongs "of twisted and knotted cord or catgut," while one of the "privileged" preachers looked on and laughed at such an infliction as, if suffered to be completed, would have amounted to one hundred and ten lashes each, as the poor women were dragged through dirt and snow half-leg deep, and the weather bitter cold. And all because the women had the impudent presumption to claim the right and privilege of being Quakers. In this case when the poor, tortured women had been lashed through three towns with ten stripes each in each town, the people arose in their righteous indignation and set the "ghastly pilgrims" free.*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.20*

Oh, yes, the Puritan was indeed "not willing to allow any privileged classes!" But may Heaven protect this dear land from any revival of Puritan rule, or any other rule according to Puritan principles.*SITI July 21, 1887, page 448.21*

July 28, 1887

"That Cloud of Witnesses" The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

"Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, Looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith." *SITI July 28, 1887, page 454.1*

The word "witnesses," in this text, conveys to many a wrong idea, or, rather, many persons give it a meaning which does not belong to it in this place. A witness is one who testifies in a cause, from personal knowledge, and in this sense it is used here. This chapter is a continuation of the argument on faith, and the cloud or multitude of witnesses who are here spoken of are the worthies whose deeds are recorded in chapter 11. They are not "witnesses" in the sense that they are *looking on* to see us run the race, for all of them except Enoch died. Now of the dead it is said that "they know not anything" (*Ecclesiastes 9:5*); that in the day of their death their "thoughts perish" (*Psalms 146:4*); and that they are not conscious of the elevation or disgrace of even their dearest relatives. *Job 14:21*. It is certain, then, that those of whom the apostle says that they "all died in faith," are not cognizant of anything that is now taking place on this earth. How then are they "witnesses"? They have all run the race, and obtained great victories through faith; and by means of the sacred record their lives bear witness to the power of a firm, abiding faith. Of Abel it is said that "he being dead yet speaketh." So likewise all these worthies are standing by to cheer us on by their testimony as to the possibility of making the race a success. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 454.2*

One stanza of an excellent hymn that is based on this passage, is ruined because the writer of the hymn mistook the meaning of the word "witnesses." The stanza is this:- *SITI July 28, 1887, page 454.3*

"A cloud of witnesses around,
Hold thee in full *survey*;
Forget the steps already trod,
And onward urge thy way." *SITI July 28, 1887, page 454.4*

But this is not true. These witnesses do not hold us in survey. They know nothing of our existence. In short, they know nothing at all, because they are dead. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 454.5*

"Seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses." The position of a small word in a sentence may make a great deal of difference. The word "also" is here out of its proper place. The text should read thus: "Wherefore seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, *let us also* lay aside every weight," etc. It is not true, as implied in the common version, that those in ancient times were compassed about with witnesses. The Bible was not written in their day, and they had no precedent for their faith. Noah had no example of those who had trusted in God before his time, and had been preserved. He had simply the word of God. There had been no rain on the earth, and if the philosophers of his day were like those of the present time, they doubtless said that such a thing was contrary to nature. Nevertheless he believed and obeyed the word of the Lord, and by so doing he "condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." *SITI July 28, 1887, page 454.6*

Abraham was called out from heathen surroundings, and "went out, not knowing whither he went." He had not before him a long list of persons who had tested the promises of God, and found them sure. So far as we know he had never been associated with anyone who worshiped the true God. Still he had evidence enough. He had "two immutable things," the promise and the oath of God. But we have in addition to these a great array of men "subject to like passions as we are," who gained glorious victories through faith in God. Since they accomplished such great victories through faith, let us be encouraged to do likewise. If they, who had so much less light and encouragement than we have, persevered thus manfully, what patience and faith and zeal ought we not to exhibit! *SITI July 28, 1887, page 454.7*

The apostle declares that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." *Romans 15:4*. Now there is to us abundant ground of hope, in the lives of the patriarchs. We seldom take all the encouragement from the record of their lives that we ought. We are apt to imagine that those men were composed of different stuff from what men are now, that there was something peculiar in their natures which gave them favor with God. But this is not so. Some sin or weakness appears in the life of nearly everyone. Human nature was the same in their day that it is now. Wherein, then, was their strength? Simply in this: They were able to take God at his word. It is written, "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." All the difference between them and us is that they believed implicitly, while we doubt. But it is just as easy for us to believe as it was for them; otherwise there would be no propriety in giving them as our example. Indeed, it ought to be easier for us,

since we have their lives as assurance that God is "a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." If human nature is the same now that it was then, we have the assurance that God is the same also, and is just as ready to give us his aid in transforming ourselves, that we may be partakers of the divine nature. The lives of these worthies, and the exhortation of the apostle were not written for nothing. Will we give them the attention that they deserve? *W.SITI July 28, 1887, page 454.8*

"The Promise of His Coming" The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

In the second epistle of Peter, the third chapter, and the third and fourth verses, we find the following statement: "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." From this, we indirectly learn two things: First, that in the last days there will be some who are teaching that the Lord is coming; for if no one were asserting that there is a promise to that effect, there would be no reason for the inquiry as to where that promise may be found. And, second, we learn that there is such a promise, and that those who teach it are correct, for they who question it are "scoffers" who walk after their own lusts. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 455.1*

The question in itself is a perfectly legitimate one, if it is asked from a sincere desire to know the truth. It is only when asked by those who are "willingly ignorant," that there is in it the element of mockery. For the benefit of the first class, a Scriptural answer to the question will be given. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 455.2*

The question "Will Christ come?" does not admit of argument. The answer is given in the Bible in plain and unequivocal language. Admit the Bible to be the inspired word of God, and the question is at once answered in the affirmative. In this article, therefore, little more can be done than to cite the reader to a few of the passages which positively affirm that Christ is coming again to this earth. Those passages only will be quoted which state the simple fact. Other questions as to the time, manner, object etc., of his coming will be considered hereafter. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 455.3*

Perhaps the oldest direct testimony concerning Christ's second advent is found in the *fourteenth verse of Jude*. "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints." This testimony, although second-hand may not be impeached, for it is from one who "walked with God," and is vouched for by "the servant of Jesus Christ." *SITI July 28, 1887, page 455.4*

Another testimony is found in Numbers, *chapter 24*, and *verse 17* verse. It may be objected that Balaam was a wicked man, and, therefore, not entitled to credit; but we must remember that at this time he was under the influence of the Spirit of God, and unable to say anything except as God permitted him. Speaking of what shall happen "in the latter days," he says: "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh; there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Scepter shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth." The language used, as well as the context, shows that Christ is referred to; and it is his second coming that is spoken of for it is then that Christ's enemies are to be destroyed. See *2 Thessalonians 1:7-9; 2:8*. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 455.5*

But we have still more positive testimony in the Old Testament. Job, in the midst of his afflictions, comforted himself in the following manner: "Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever! For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that *he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth*: And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." *Job 19:23-27*. This language is very positive; and Job shows his sense of its importance by wishing it to be preserved by all the means of writing then known. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.1*

Passing to the Psalms we read the testimony of David. That David was inspired of God, we learn from *2 Samuel 23:2*: "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." He says: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." *Psalms 50:3*. Again: "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fullness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein: then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice before the Lord; for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth." *Psalms 96:11-13*. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.2*

We come now to the New Testament, and we shall see that the testimony is even more positive. Paul's words in *Hebrews 9:27, 28* are very explicit: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him *shall he appear the second time* without sin unto salvation." There is nothing figurative or uncertain about these words. They are a plain declaration of fact. Either Christ will come the second time, or else Paul is an unreliable witness. The

latter, no Christian will admit. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.3*

Again Paul writes: "For this we say unto you *by the word of the Lord*, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. *For the Lord himself shall descend* from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God." Could language be made plainer than this? This is a statement of what shall actually occur. No more definite language can be found in the Bible. It will not do to evade this testimony by saying that Paul did not understand what he wrote. There is not the slightest evidence that he did not fully comprehend the force of every line that he wrote; but even allowing that he did not, the Holy Spirit, which inspired him, certainly did understand what he wrote, and had an object in giving it. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.4*

Although no clearer evidence can be given than that quoted above, yet the words which come to us direct from the lips of our Lord himself, have a peculiar force. In *Matthew 16:27* he says: "For the Son of man *shall come* in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." The twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew is devoted entirely to a description of his coming, but as we are now giving direct answers to the question "Will he come?" we pass this by for the present. The same subject, however, is carried on in the twenty-fifth chapter, and in the thirty-first verse Christ says: "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." He here speaks of his coming as a settled fact, so that his words amount to a positive statement. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.5*

In *John 14:1-3*, we have a statement by our Lord, which, if such a thing is possible, is even stronger than any of the foregoing. As Jesus was about to leave this earth, he comforted his sorrowing disciples with the following words: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." The point of comfort in the above is the promise that he would come again. The disciples were sorrowing because he had said he was going away. He says, Be not troubled; I will come again. He did not deceive them with a false hope; he will certainly come again. His word is pledged to this and it cannot fail. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.6*

These are only a few of the many passages which teach that Christ will come again, but they are sufficient. They are so simple that a child can understand them. No other meaning can possibly attach to them than that Christ is coming the second time to this earth. The Bible abounds with testimony to the same effect. And yet there are people who profess to believe the Bible, who say that the second coming of Christ is a non-essential doctrine. If it is not essential, why is it given so large a place in the Bible? *W. SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.7*

"Bible Exposition Against Human Speculation" The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

Says the *Independent*: "The anthropology of the Bible as to what awaits man after death is comprehensively given in these words: 'Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.' The body sinks into the bosom of its mother earth, and moulders back to dust; but the soul ascends back to God, and meets the issues of another life." *SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.8*

This doubtless expresses the unthinking belief of thousands, yet it is inconsistent and unscriptural in the following particulars:—*SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.9*

1. It starts out with a Bible statement concerning the Spirit, and ends with the human statement concerning the soul, thus assuming that soul and spirit are identical; whereas: *SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.10*
2. Soul and spirit are not the same. Paul prayed that the Thessalonians might be sanctified in their "whole spirit and soul and body." *1 Thessalonians 5:23. SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.11*
3. The Spirit, which returns to God, is identical with the breath of life. Job said: "All the while my breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my nostrils; my lips shall not speak wickedness, nor my tongue utter deceit." *Job 27:3, 4.* Compare with the expression, "the Spirit of God is in my nostrils," *Isaiah 2:22*: "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?" That which is in the nostrils is breath, but it is also called Spirit; and the translators made a just comment on *Job 27:3*, "the Spirit of God is in my nostrils," when they placed in the margin, "That is, *the breath which God gave him, Genesis 2:7.*" *SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.12*
4. Man was a soul, although lifeless, before he received his breath or spirit from God. See *Genesis 2:7*: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man

became a living soul." The old catechisms recognize the fact, unconsciously, perhaps, when they say that "man is a dual being, composed of a body and soul." But the Bible says that *man* was formed of the dust of the ground. That everything which goes to constitute a man is also of the dust; the addition of the breath of life makes a *living man*. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 456.13*

5. Nothing can come from man except that which was given him. There can be no more elements after dissolution than were made use of in building him. Now *Genesis 2:7* is the record of the building of man, and *Ecclesiastes 12:7* is the record of the manner of his unbuilding; therefore we must find the very same parts in *Ecclesiastes 12:7* that we find in *Genesis 2:7*. In *Genesis 2:7* we find dust, of which man is formed, and *breath* breathed into his nostrils to make him alive. In *Ecclesiastes 12:7* we have the spirit or breath returning to the One who gave it, and the man returning to the dust of which he was formed. Now unless the *Independent* is willing to claim, and able to prove, that the *breath* which God gave Adam was conscious before Adam received it, or that it ever obtained consciousness while Adam had it, it had no right to assume that, it was conscious when it left Adam. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 457.1*

6. Let it be emphasized that nothing "returns" to God except that which God gave, and that all that came directly from God in the making of man, was the breath. Now read two Bible statements concerning the unmaking of man, which corroborate the positions to stated: "If he [God] set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." *Job 34:14, 15*. And this: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." *Psalms 146:3, 4*. These passages cover exactly the same ground as *Ecclesiastes 12:7*. Bible expositions of the text are much better and more trustworthy than human assumption. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 457.2*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

Under a new treaty lately made the United States and Mexico are made practically one country in the matter of postage. Hereafter letters and packages can be sent from this country to any place in Mexico as cheap as from one place to another in the United States. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.1*

The cruel and senseless antipathy to the negro is becoming more general and more marked in the North. Lately the House of Mercy in the city of New York refused to receive a girl committed to it, solely because she is colored. At this the *Independent* very aptly exclaims, "Mercy!" It is very certain that that is not the kind of mercy whose equality is not strained. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.2*

The *Catholic Mirror* says that out of a population in Mexico of 10,105,000, the church claims 9,864,000. If only she could claim the whole 10,105,000 then Mexico would be a "Christian nation" after the National Reformer's own heart. However, as it is, Mexico is one of the countries which "could be represented only by Roman Catholics," in "a world's conference for the promotion of national Christianity," as suggested by the *Christian Statesman*. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.3*

As a good deal is being said about the great age of the Emperor Wilhelm, a German paper hunted up and published the names of all the people in Prussia that are older than he is. The list contains one hundred and sixty names of persons who are over one hundred years old. As there are many more who are more than ninety years old, and as the Emperor was only ninety on his last birthday, Kaiser Wilhelm may well feel himself not so very old after all. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.4*

The New York *Observer* complains that "Sunday newspapers have done more than all other influences combined to destroy the popular reverence for the Sabbath." And then almost in the same breath *naively* states that "during the summer season thousands of nominal Christians will find the Sunday newspaper where they will fail to find a place of worship or the hour of prayer." Therefore abolish the Sunday newspaper without delay. By all means take away at once all opportunity for these very excellent nominal Christian to do wrong, so that they may all become real strong, vigorous Christians (?) by doing because they have no chance to do other than the Sunday newspaper may be a very wicked thing, but how much more wicked it is than the professed Christian who would rather read it than to go to worship or to prayer perhaps the *Observer* can decide, but we can't. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.5*

"More of Rome's Work" The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

The New York *Observer* says:- *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.6*

"There is no sign of diminution in the political activity of the Pope. Daily telegrams give him credit for efforts of one kind and another in many different quarters. It was cabled to the *Herald*, June 30, that King Leopold, of Belgium, had applied to the Vatican to influence the party of the right to secure the passage of a bill relating to personal military service. Manager Rampolia, the Papal Secretary, is said to favor the measure. Much of this political influence will be of no advantage to the Church of Rome, and some of it may do harm. It might be better for all concerned if the Pope would apply himself to the finances of the Church of Rome in Ohio, where the debt of the two estates of Archbishop John B. and Father Edward Purcell is reported at \$3,739,321, and the number of creditors that have proven claims is 3,196. Local efforts to meet the necessities of most indigent creditors are entirely insufficient." *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.7*

There is no danger of "this political influence" doing harm to the Church of Rome. Every particle of it will be turned to the advantage of the Papacy. The Papacy is to-day the most influential political power in the world, and in trickery, chicanery, or political influence of whatever kind Rome is abundantly able to outdo every other power, to reap advantage from every alliance, and to come out ahead in every contest. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.8*

And as for her ever restoring what she has embezzled from the poor Catholics of Cincinnati through the two Purcells-archbishop and priest-people might as well whistle at the wind, as to call for that. So far is she from restoring any of it, she is actually adding to it the possessions of the assignee and his bondsmen of the bankrupt (?) estates. The *Catholic Mirror*, of July 16, gives the result of the first turn of the wheel. It says:-*SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.9*

"Judge Goeble, of the Probate Court of Cincinnati, has announced the result of his investigation into the liability of J. B. Mannix and his bondsmen as assignees of the estates of Archbishop Purcell and his brother, Father Edward Purcell. He found that he was entitled to no compensation for his services as assignee, and that he and his bondsmen owe to the Edward Purcell estate \$78,000, and that Mannix and his bondsmen owe to the J. B. Purcell estate \$236,500. Judge Hoadly, one of the sureties, has been released by the payment of \$62,500." *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.10*

The only way in which ex-Governor Hoadly got released, however, was by paying into court everything he had, making himself a bankrupt in his old age. And now others have to follow suit, perhaps with the same result. But it is a most singular thing that the courts can find hundreds of thousands of dollars due the estates from the assignee and his bondsmen, and yet cannot find in the estates a single cent for the poor people who have been robbed of it. The fact is that Rome has the money, and she will get as much more as possible, and she will wear out all the courts in Christendom before she will restore a cent of it. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.11*

"Prussia at the Pope's Feet" The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

The Pope has sent out a note of rejoicing over his triumphant conquest of Germany, upon which, under the above heading, the *Christian Advocate* comments as follows:-*SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.12*

"One of the most pitiable spectacles presented in these later days to the world's gaze is that of Prussia-great and Protestant Prussia-doing obeisance to the Pope of Rome. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.13*

"If any human force could make Martin Luther and Philip Melancthon arise from their graves beneath the marble slabs in the Wittenburg church, it would be this. But, alas! so bound hand and foot is their land to-day, that not one strong voice in the whole country dares to sound the alarm and tell the whole civilized world what is going on in Berlin. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.14*

"The climax has just been reached in the Pope's allocution, which came by cablegram from Rome. His holiness appeals to the whole world to hear his cry of victory over German Protestantism. Here are some of his jubilant notes:-*SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.15*

"We felt more concerned at the evils of this religious struggle with Prussia, and as we were unable to remedy them by striving alone, owing to the obstacles which impeded our power, we invoked the cooperation of the German bishops and the Catholic deputies in the Prussian diet, from whose constancy and concord the church derived great fruits, and expects still greater. Thanks to the equitable and pacific sentiments of Emperor William and his counselors the Prussian Government removed the more serious inconveniences, and then accepted the various practical conditions of peace, by which some of the former laws against the church have been repealed and others mitigated. Something remains, but we must rejoice at what we have obtained, and, above all, in regard to the free action of the Pope in the government of the church in Prussia." *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.16*

"If Bismarck is not entirely blind to all Protestant sentiment, and is not utterly consumed by his love of Prussian imperialism, whatever becomes of the people, he must have some sense of shame when he reads the Pope's allocution-that this triumph of Romanism in Germany is made the basis of an appeal to Italy to range herself on the side of Papal interests. Germany more Catholic than Italy! That is the picture now, and the world is told so by Leo XIII." *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.17*

"Owning the Responsibility" The Signs of the Times, 13, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

Speaking of the wild methods of the Salvation Army the *Christian Advocate* very appropriately remarks that:-*SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.18*

"If the Methodist Episcopal, the Baptist, and other churches were as energetic, zealous, and spiritually-minded as they should be, and in earlier times were, and as deeply interested in the conversion of the abandoned as the Methodists were when they could get a hearing from no other class, there would be no need or place for any such irregular guerrilla religious warfare." *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.19*

There is no need anyhow for any such irregular guerrilla religious warfare as is carried on by the Salvation Army; but there is a world of suggestiveness in that idea of the Methodists being deeply interested in the conversion of the abandoned, *when they could get a hearing from no other class*. Those were the days of the genuine power of Methodism, because they were the days of her humility. But now her humility is gone and her power with it. Shorn of her humility, she is as weak as any other, and can only stand and complacently view and tacitly indorse the irregular guerrilla religious warfare of the Salvation Army. Nor is she the exception. *SITI July 28, 1887, page 464.20*

August 4, 1887

"The Besetting Sin" The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

"Let us lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us." The apostle here takes the figure from the running course, where the contestant before starting in the race would lay aside every superfluous thing. Nothing was retained that would in the least hinder his progress. So we must lay aside everything that would hinder our progress in the divine life. These weights are of various kinds; some we have by nature, and others we voluntarily assume. Their number is legion, comprising every sin and evil tendency common to mankind. Barnes well says that "some very light objects, in themselves considered, become material and weighty encumbrances. Even a feather or a ring-such may be the fondness for these toys-may become such a weight that those who wear them will never make much progress toward the prize." The original signifies something that may be hooked or fastened on. Constant watchfulness, therefore, is required on the part of the runner, lest, after he has laid aside a certain weight, Satan, who is ever on the alert, may fasten it on again.*SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.1*

In addition to the "weights," of which different people have different kinds, there is a constantly recurring sin, to which all are liable, and which not only hinders our progress, but effectually stops it. If we trace the connection between *Hebrews 12* and the two preceding chapters, we cannot fail to see that the sin to which the apostle here refers is the sin of unbelief. *Verses 90* closes with these words: "Now the just shall live by faith; but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. But we are not of them who draw back unto perdition; of them that the leave to the saving of the soul." The eleventh begins with a definition of faith, and continues with notable examples of it, showing that without faith it is impossible to please God. Then, the exhortation which we are now considering. Many suppose that by "the sin which doth so easily be beset us," the apostle means some especial sin to which have differed persons are liable, differing in different cases. So we hear of impatience as the besetting sin of one person, and covetousness as the besetting sin of another. But the apostle speaks of "the sin," and not of the *sin* which so easily besets us. It is a fact that may be demonstrated, that lack of faith is the greatest source of trouble with every person, manifesting itself, of course, in many different ways. Lack of faith keeps back thousands from being Christians, and causes many professed Christians to stumble and fall by the way.*SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.2*

The word which is rendered "easily beset," does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. It properly means "the surrounding," and has been defined, "easy to encircle." Tindal renders it, "the sin that hangeth on us." Bloomfield supposes that it means "the sin which especially winds around us and hinders our course," with reference to the longer garment worn by the ancients, which, if not removed or fastened up, would wind around the legs of the runner, and cause him to fall. In harmony with this view is the exhortation given to "gird the loins of your mind," meaning to have faith.*SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.3*

How few there are who believe with all their heart. But a belief that admits of a doubt is not faith. True faith is that condition into which not the slightest element of disbelief enters. Who has the faith of Abraham, or Noah, or Moses? We think we have faith because we assent to the most prominent doctrines of the Bible, or to what is known as the "Third Angel's Message." A simple belief that Jesus is the Son of God, and that all the ten commandments are still as binding as when they were given, will not save it anybody. "The devil's believe and tremble," their belief is not imputed to them for righteousness; they are devils still. Genuine faith in the Third Angel's Message is evinced by a practical reception and of all the truths brought out by it. Among them may be mentioned the spirit of the prophecy. One who does not believe in this is not a believer in the message, it is one of the main points. Compare *Revelation 12:17* with *Revelation 19:10*, etc. But this also involves a practical believe in true temperance, that is a vital part of the Third Angel's Message. True temperance, or health reform, as it is termed, has been declared to bear the same relation to the last message that the right arm does to the body. Then if we do not believe and practice it, our faith is a crippled faith.*SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.4*

We may also show our lack of faith by neglecting to render to God his dues. Among nearly all denominations the tithing system is now recognized as the Bible plan of supporting those who labor in the cause of God. It is founded on the same principle as the Sabbath-the right of property. "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord;" whoever uses that time for himself takes that to which he has no right. So also "the tithe is the Lord's," and whoever does not return it to him is guilty of robbery. Men who would scorn to defraud their neighbors of a dime, will systematically rob God, and think there is no wrong done. The Bible bears no uncertain testimony on this point. In astonishment the prophet says, by direct inspiration from God, "Will a man rob God?" Someone will say, No; a man cannot rob God. But listen: "Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." *Malachi 3:8, 9*. Abraham did not do so, for he paid tithes to the Lord's servant. Noah, in gratitude for his preservation, sacrificed not merely one-tenth, but one-seventh of his property. The neglect to honor the

Lord with our substance, and with the first-fruits of all our increase (*Proverbs 3:9*), is a most flagrant manifestation of unbelief. God makes his care for us both temporal and spiritual, dependent on our remembering him; but if we do not thus honor him, we intimate that we have no faith in his ability or willingness to care for us, or else that we lightly esteemed his protection. W.SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.5

"Manner of Christ's Coming" The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

It is most unfortunate that the tendency nowadays is almost entirely against a literal interpretation of the Scriptures. It seems difficult for people to understand that Christ and the apostles ever spoken plain, simple language, such as one person would use in speaking to another. Whenever a passage is read, the first thought with many is, What hidden meaning is there in it? What lesson is conveyed? Any one who reads the popular Sunday-school comments will see this tendency conspicuously displayed. Now it is proper to search the Scriptures; and if there be a difficult text, it is right to find out its meaning, by comparing it with other texts; but there are some things that are so plain that any attempt at explanation only obscures the meaning. And this is the case with by far the greater part of the Bible.SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.6

It is true that there are parables, but these are readily distinguished from the direct, simple statements, and are usually either explained, or in such common use as to need no explanation. When Christ was on earth, one of the proofs of his divine mission was that the poor had the Gospel preached unto them; consequently we should expect his teaching to be such as could be understood by poor people who have not had the advantages of an education. And this is the case. The Bible is a model of simplicity; it uses the language of the common people.SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.7

We have seen how very plain and direct the statements are in the Bible concerning the second coming of Christ. No believer in the Bible pretends to deny these statements, for to do so would be to deny the Bible. But there are very many who evade these statements, and virtually deny them, by claiming that Christ's second coming is spiritual. Some claim that Christ comes when a good man dies; and others claim that his coming is at conversion; while others still, carrying the latter idea out still further, claim that there will sometime in the future be a temporal millennium, when all men shall have been converted, and that Christ will then come and reign over his people spiritually, and that this is what is meant by the second coming of Christ.SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.8

Now the Bible is just as definite in regard to the manner of Christ's coming, as it is in regard to the fact of his coming. It plainly says that Christ will come personally and visibly. The texts which prove this will of course furnish additional evidence that Christ will certainly come.SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.9

And first it may be well to notice *Hebrews 9:28*: "And unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." Christ is to come the *second* time; but if the theory that he comes at death or conversion be correct, he would already have come many thousands of times.SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.10

Again, the time of Christ's ministry here on earth, of which we have a record in the New Testament, is conceded by all to be his first advent. But men had been converted previously to that time, and for thousands of years good men had been dying. If Christ comes at conversion or at death, he must have come millions of times before his first advent. Anyone can see the absurdity of those theories.SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.11

It is not denied that Christ has, at different times in the world's history, met and conversed with certain of his devoted followers, or that he is ever present with his people by his Spirit; but nothing of this kind can be referred to in the texts under consideration.SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.12

It would, however, be manifestly inconsistent to refer to any one of these times as the second coming of Christ. One of them has no precedence over another. But there was one time when he was here in person, when he talked with thousands, and was seen by thousands more. At that time there was probably no nation on earth that did not know of him and his mighty works; and there has been no nation since then that has not heard of that wonderful event. Now at that time he said he was coming "*again*," and Paul speaking of that first advent and its object, said that he would come the "*second* time." Consistency, therefore, would demand that his second coming be also personal and visible, and no less conspicuous nor less widely known than his first. And this we are positively told shall be the case: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every *eye shall see him*, and they also which pierced him." *Revelation 1:7*.SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.13

Again we read: "For the Son of Man shall, in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." *Matthew 16:27*. Those who place the second coming of Christ at death, or

at conversion, must have a very faint conception of the glory of the Father. When the Lord came down on Sinai, "the whole mountain quaked greatly" (*Exodus 19:18*); and when the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle, even Moses was not able to enter. See *Exodus 40:34, 35*. The glory of a single angel, at the resurrection of Jesus, caused the Roman guard to fall as dead men. *Matthew 28:4*. What then will be the manifestation when he comes in his own glory, and that of the Father, and all the holy angels? This glory which will attend Christ's coming is thus described: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him." *Psalms 50:3*. Paul says that when Christ comes he will be "revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire." *2 Thessalonians 1:7, 8*. That this glory will be seen by all is proved by *Revelation 1:7* already quoted, and by the words of our Saviour in *Matthew 24:27*: "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." Any one who has seen the lightning flash across the sky in the sheets so tensely bright to that even the closed eyelids could not wholly shut out the impression, can appreciate to a faint degree the terror of that day. Of the key facts of that glory, we learn again *2 Thessalonians 2:8*: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." The fire that David says shall "devour before him," is the glory of his presence. *SITI August 4, 1887, page 470.14*

Nothing further is needed to prove that the coming of the Lord will be nothing like the quiet of a death-bed scene, or the hour when an individual gives his heart to God. There are, however, a host of other texts on this point, no less strong than those already quoted. Two only will be given to show how literal and personal that coming is. The first is *Acts 1:9-11*: "And when he had spoken these things, *while they beheld*, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up in heaven? *this same Jesus*, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." The second is *1 Thessalonians 4:16*: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the *trump of God*; and the dead in Christ shall rise first." *SITI August 4, 1887, page 471.1*

These texts speak for themselves. The language is clear and plain, and anyone can understand them. And yet, who can realize the terrible scene which they foretell? The human mind cannot conceive of the awful grandeur of that hour when the Lord of heaven and earth shall be revealed. Let each one ask himself the question:-*SITI August 4, 1887, page 471.2*

"How will my heart endure
The terrors of that day,
When the earth and heaven, before the judge,
Astonished, shrink away!" W. *SITI August 4, 1887, page 471.3*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

We heartily agree with the following statement by the *Journal* and *The Messenger*:-*SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.1*

"The Sabbath-school is the church at steady, while the service following is the church worship. Parents and children should unite in both. In the former they may separate into classes according to mental attainments, but in the latter they should be together." *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.2*

The camp-meeting in Eureka, Cal., will be held on the same ground as last year-Cormick's Grove, between II and I Streets. It is hoped that every Sabbath-keeper in Humboldt County will be present at this meeting, unless unnecessarily detained at home by sickness. Besides the regular religious services, instruction will be given in various parts of the work, which no one can afford to lose. *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.3*

There has been much questioning among the brethren in California, whether or not the General Conference would be held in this state this year. We are glad to be able to announce that beyond all doubt the Conference will be held in Oakland this fall. Word has been received from the General Conference Committee to this effect. We are not informed as to the time, as it has not yet been fixed. Work is being pushed forward on the Oakland house of worship, which, according to contract, will be completed by the first of November. *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.4*

We are able to announce that at the Eureka camp-meeting special attention will be given to the interests of the Sabbath-school. The State Secretary will be present for the express purpose of giving instruction in the work of keeping records, making of reports, etc., and especially of helping the teachers in the primary departments, so that they may become more efficient workers with the little ones. Every Sabbath-school

officer and teacher should be present. All teachers and secretaries are requested to bring their record books to the meeting. *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.5*

Cardinal Gibbons was in Washington Sunday, July 10, and, as the *Catholic Mirror* reports it: "At the special request of President Cleveland his eminence called upon the former at the executive mansion. The cardinal recounted some of the features of his interesting trip abroad, to which the President listened with evident pleasure. Mr. Cleveland expressed his pleasure at the safe return of his eminence in good health, and the distinguished pair parted with cordial manifestations of mutual esteem and respect." Yes, the influence of the Catholic vote is very respectable, and Rome is very glad to make as many visits as possible to the executive mansion, so the respect is "mutual." *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.6*

For the first time in the history of Iowa the State penitentiary at Fort Madison is so short of convicts as to prevent the fulfillment of the prison contracts. One such fact as this is a stronger argument in favor of Prohibition than are ten thousand utterances against it of the cry that "Prohibition does not prohibit." When Prohibition so interferes with the business of penitentiaries that they cannot fulfill contracts made on the basis of crimes committed, then that is tangible proof that Prohibition *does* prohibit a large per cent of *crime* at the very least. And in so largely prohibiting crime, it must in the very nature of things prohibit that which leads to the commission of crime, and the connection is perfectly clear that it is liquor-drinking that leads to most of the crime. Let Prohibition succeed everywhere and continue forever. *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.7*

"Intemperance Rampant" The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

Quite recently Mrs. Margaret Parker, of Dundee Scotland, the World's Organizer of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, was interviewed by a reporter concerning the status of temperance in the world. As Mrs. Parker is one of the foremost temperance women in the world, and is probably possessed of the best information on that subject, the following extract from the interview will be of interest: - *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.8*

"Do you find that the temperance movement has been gaining ground in the past few years?" *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.9*

"I find that the temperance movement is winning adherents but I also find that the liquor traffic is advancing immeasurably faster. Why, I see since my last visit to America that the liquor business has fairly made leaps and bounds. Saloons and places of iniquity have sprung up by the myriads. No, I am sorry to confess that liquor has far outdistanced temperance of late years. There is a growing temperance feeling, it is true, but the opportunities for indulging in iniquity are increased by the tenfold." *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.10*

"Do you find the same condition of affairs all over the world?" *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.11*

"Pretty much so, but more particularly in Great Britain and America. It is difficult to decide which of the two has become the greater victim. But there is one thing I do not observe and that is that liquor has a much less hold on women in America than in Great Britain. I rarely see a woman touch intoxicants here, but it is far too common, I regret to confess, among my countrywomen." *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.12*

One would naturally wonder what comfort those who are expecting the universal triumph of good in this world could gather from the fact that although temperance is growing, intemperance is increasing tenfold. But Mrs. Parker is not at all discouraged, because she expects that the ballot will very soon be given to win, which, she says, will make everything right. *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.13*

"Don't They Know Better?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

On a recent Sunday Paul Boynton, the famous swimmer, gave a public exhibition by floating in a rubber suit (after his usual fashion) from Holyoke to Springfield, in the State of Massachusetts; and, as might have been expected, the thousands of idle and curious people lined the river banks to witness the spectacle, which was attended with considerable noise because of the salutes which everywhere greeted the swimmer. This circumstance a correspondent of the *Congregationalist* takes as a text for a sharp sermon on the sin of violating the "Sabbath," which title he applies to Sunday. *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.14*

Of course Boynton's exhibitions are not worth seeing; but assuming that they are wrong because given on Sunday, is simply begging the whole question; for we cannot for a moment suppose that either the editor of the *Congregationalist* or the correspondent who wrote the article is so ignorant of divine truth as not to know

that Sunday is not the Sabbath; and that, therefore, if such an exhibition is right on any day it is not wrong on Sunday, simply because it takes place upon that day. But the *sang-froid* with which so-called orthodox ministers and editors insist that Sunday is the Sabbath, would be amusing were not for the innate wickedness of the deception which they are thus palming off upon the people. *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.15*

All who teach such palpable errors that Sunday is the Sabbath, should consider well the question: "Have ye not seen a vain vision, and have ye not spoken a lying divination, and whereas ye say, the Lord saith it; albeit I have not spoken?" *Ezekiel 13:7*. And if they are honest with themselves and with God they must answer that they have done this very thing: for "they have seen vanity and lying divination, saying, The Lord saith; and the Lord hath not sent them; and they have made others to hope that they would confirm the word." *Verse 6. SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.16*

"They are foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing;" for, as every intelligent Bible student knows, there is not one word in that book to justify any man in calling the first day of the week the Sabbath. The Scriptures of both the Old and New Testaments know but one Sabbath, to wit, the seventh day of the week, the day just before the first day of the week, the day upon which the holy women "rested according to the commandment," before coming to anoint the body of the Saviour. See *Luke 23:56; 24:1. SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.17*

"Reckless Statements" The Signs of the Times, 13, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

Some weeks ago we made the statement that Sunday-keeping and infant baptism rest upon precisely the same ground, namely, human tradition; and that no one can give any good reason for receiving the one rather than the other. For this the *Baptist Flag* takes us to task, and stoutly asserts, but does not at all attempt to prove, that Sunday was "established as the 'Lord's day' by example of Christ and his inspired apostles;" and that "the first day of the week, Sunday, or Sabbath, was observed by the apostolic Church from the time of Christ, for hundreds of years before the rise of Popery!" *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.18*

This statement, soberly made in a religious journal, serves to show the utter recklessness of those who, right or wrong, are determined to bolster up an unscriptural practice. Even if the *Flag's* first proposition were true, its second could not be; for there was no "apostolic church from the time of Christ, for hundreds of years before the rise of Popery." This idea of stretching the apostolic church over several centuries is certainly original with our Baptist contemporary, but it is scarcely worth copywriting; it is, however, in perfect keeping with the argument (?) that Sunday was "established as the 'Lord's day' by the example of Christ and his inspired apostles." *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.19*

There is scarcely a papal abomination for which the same claim is not made, at least so far as the example of "inspired" men is concerned. This is notably true of the practice of pouring or sprinkling for baptism. The claim that affusion is apostolic is made with the utmost apparent confidence even by learned men in several of the most respectable and influential churches; and yet there is not an intelligent Baptist anywhere who does not know that there is not a shadow of truth in it. Anyone reading the Bible without bias or prejudice would certainly conclude that immersion an immersion alone is baptism; and just as surely must the candid reader conclude that the seventh day is the only divinely appointed Sabbath or Lord's day. And to turn aside from the Scriptures and recognize the authority of tradition, even though it claim to be apostolic, is simply to open the floodgates of error; and they who do it are not really Protestants, even though be Baptists, for the fundamental principle of Protestantism is that the Bible is a sufficient rule faith and practice, while Popery asserts that apostolic or church tradition is of equal authority. Sunday-keeping is not taught in the Scripture and is, therefore, not Protestant but Papal. *SITI August 4, 1887, page 480.20*

August 11, 1887

"The Making of the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 13, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

At the Baptist Ministers' and Layman's Conference, recently held in Oakland, one of the ministers read a paper on the "Seventh-day Sabbath," which was, as usual, highly satisfactory to those who have their minds already made up that Sunday is the only Sabbath. We have looked with interest for the publication of the paper, but finding that nothing worthy of an extended review. The writer claims that the seventh-day Sabbath was only a Jewish institution, that it originated at the exode and ended at the cross, and that the Sunday Sabbath is an institution by itself, having no connection whatever with the fourth commandment. In this latter proposition the writer is correct, for the Sunday institution certainly has nothing to do with the fourth commandment, except to be condemned by it; and since all moral duty is contained in the ten commandments, it follows, from this Baptist writer's admission, that there is no moral obligation attaching to the observance of Sunday.*SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.1*

That the author of the article in question has no knowledge of the seventh-day argument, will be evident to anyone who reads the following:-*SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.2*

"The Sabbatarian bases his theory largely upon the following passage:-*SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.3*

"And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day for all his work which yet made. And God bless the seventh day, and sanctified yet; because that in it he had wrested from all his work which God created and made." *Genesis 2:2, 3*. It will be observed that these words contain no precept or command. We have in them a simple historical statement, and that is all. The substance of the statement is this: *God ended his work on the seventh day; on that day he rested, and in so doing he blessed and sanctified it.*"*SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.4*

It is true that a great deal does rest upon *Genesis 2:2, 3*. It is also true that that passage contains no precept or command, and that it contains only a simple historical statement. But it is also a fact that it contains a simple historical statement that the commandment was given enforcing the observance of the seventh day. This we shall show, and in so doing we shall also show how the author of the paper referred to has utterly failed to comprehend either the Scripture or the argument based upon it. He says:-*SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.5*

"The substance of the statement [in *Genesis 2:2, 3*] is this: God ended his work on the seventh creation day; on that day he rested, and in so doing he blessed and sanctified it." *SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.6*

It is possible that there are many others who have read the Scripture thus carelessly. Let such read it again with us, carefully: "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he *had rested* from all his work which God created and made." That is very far from saying that God rested on the seventh day, and that "*in so doing* he blessed and sanctified it." The blessing and the sanctification are entirely distinct from the resting, and were subsequent to it. God blessed and sanctified the seventh day, "because that in it *he had rested*." *SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.7*

Three acts went to make the Sabbath a holy day for man's observance: 1. God rested upon the day. This made it a Sabbath, for Sabbath means rest. It made it the Sabbath, or rest, of the Lord; but if nothing more had been done, men would have been under no obligation to keep it. 2. "God blessed the seventh day." This was done after his rest upon it, for he blessed it *because he had rested* in it from all his work. 3. God sanctified the seventh day. This also was done after the rest; and in this simple statement that God sanctified the seventh day, we find the evidence that God did, at the close of this rest, command man to keep holy. The following evidence is offered in proof:-*SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.8*

The word sanctify means, "to make sacred or holy; to set apart wholly or religious use; to consecrate by appropriate rights; to hallow." Now a thing cannot be set apart for a holy or religious use, unless the ones who are to so use it are informed of each setting apart; in fact, setting it apart must necessarily consistent in the notification to the people, and the commandment to observe the day thus set apart.*SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.9*

This definition is in harmony with Scripture usage. In *Exodus 19:23* we read as follows concerning Mount Sinai, just before the Lord came down upon it: "And Moses said on to the Lord, The people cannot come up to Mount Sinai; for thou of chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mountain, and sanctified it." *In verse 12* we have an inspired comment on the meaning of "sanctify" as used in this first. The Lord said to Moses: "And thou shalt set bounds under the people round about, say, Take heed to yourselves, that ye go not up into the

mouth, or touch the border of it; whosoever toucheth the mount shall be surely put to death." Thus we find that sanctifying the amount consisted in setting it apart by bounds, and forbidding the people to pass over those bounds. In like manner sanctifying the seventh day consisted in setting it apart by the sanctions of God's word, and in forbidding the people to overstep the bounds and trample upon the Sabbath.*SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.10*

These three things, resting, blessing, and sanctifying, made the Sabbath of the Lord of lasting obligation upon all people. Yet notwithstanding the bounds that were set about the seventh day, men have dared to break through it and trample the holy Sabbath under their unholy feet. And this, although the penalty against breaking through the bounds about Mount Sinai was not more severe or more sure to follow than the penalty against breaking through the bounds set around the Sabbath. But "because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." *Ecclesiastes 8:11. SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.11*

And now, to all who have broken through the bounds, and have trampled upon God's holy Sabbath, the long-suffering and merciful Father says: "If thou turn away by foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and called the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; Then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." *Isaiah 58:13, 14. W. SITI August 11, 1887, page 486.12*

"When Does the Sabbath Begin?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

This has been a puzzling question to very many. They cannot understand why Sabbath-keepers should begin their rest at the setting of the sun, while other people regard the day as beginning at midnight. Some have thought that was an arbitrary distinction more for the purpose of peculiarity than anything else; but a little reference to the Scriptures will suffice to clear the subject of all doubts.*SITI August 11, 1887, page 488.1*

In the first place, we have evidence that the first day of time began in the evening. That is, the dark portion of the day preceded the light portion. "The evening and morning were the first day." *Genesis 1:5*. That this was necessarily the case, can be seen from the order of events in the creation. Time, as distinguished from eternity, commenced with the first creative act of God. The first act was the bringing of the earth into existence. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." *Genesis 1:1*. That this occupied by a brief space of time, and not a long, extended period, is proved by the context, also by *Psalms 23:6, 9*: "By the word of the Lord for the heavens made; and although most of them by the breadth of his mouth." "For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast." But at that time there was still light, nothing but intense darkness, for we read that "darkness was upon the face of the deep." The next half was to create light. "And God said, let there be light, and there was light." *Genesis 1:3*. God thus ordained that darkness and light should henceforth succeed each other in continuous round, and a period of darkness and one of light, called respectively night and day, should constitute one entire day. This completed the first day's work. The first day began with darkness, and ended as darkness began once more to overspread the earth. As though to establish beyond question the fact that this was to be the order of all days, it is stated of the first six days that the "evening and morning" constituted the day. But if the first six days commenced with the evening, and ended with the following evening, it is evident that every succeeding day, the Sabbath with the rest, must begin and end in the same manner. This is further verified by *Leviticus 23:32*, where the Lord says, "From even unto even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath." *SITI August 11, 1887, page 488.2*

Having settled the fact that the day begins and ends at evening, the only thing necessary to understanding of the main question is to find when it is evening. This is easily settled by the following passages: "But at the place which the Lord thy God shall choose to place his name in, there thou shalt sacrificed the Passover at even, at the going down of the sun." *Deuteronomy 16:6*. "And the king of Ai hanged on a tree until eventide; and as soon as the sun was down, Joshua commanded that they should take his carcass down from the tree." *Joshua 8:29*. Also, *Joshua 10:26, 27*: "Joshua smote the them, and slew them, them on five trees; and they were hanging upon the trees until the evening. And it came to pass at the time of the going down of the sun, that Joshua commanded, and they took them down off the trees." *SITI August 11, 1887, page 488.3*

These texts plainly show that the evening and the setting of the sun are identical. In the New Testament we have additional testimony. In the first chapter of Mark we have an account of the events of one Sabbath in the life of Christ. First he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and taught. *Verse 21*. Here he found a man with an unclean spirit, whom he healed. *Verses 23-27*. Then he left the synagogue, and went to the house of Simon, whose mother-in-law he healed. *Verses 29-31*. The rest of the people, however, dared not ask him to heal their sick during the hours of the Sabbath, but waited till its close. We read in *verse 32*, "And

at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto him all that were diseased, and then there were possessed with devils." Thus we see that the people unanimously regarded sunset as the close of the Sabbath, and if sunset was the close of the Sabbath of course sunset twenty-four hours earlier must have been the beginning. This was the divinely appointed order.*SITI August 11, 1887, page 488.4*

The question then arises, How does it happen that people nowadays begin and end the day at midnight? The answer is this: When men became idolaters, and did not like to retain God in their knowledge (*Romans 1:28*), they soon lost all knowledge of the institutions and commandments of God, so that their forms of worship and of daily life differed entirely from those of God's people. Each nation had gods of its own, and customs peculiar to itself. The Persians and the Syrians worshiped the sun, and began the day at sunrise. That the Jews, during their captivity, did not lose their reckoning, and conformed to that of the Babylonians, is proved by the passage in Mark already quoted. The Romans, for some reason, selected midnight as the time for the beginning and ending of their day. The barbarous tribes that conquered Rome accepted her customs, and transmitted them to their descendants. Thus the Roman method of beginning the day has become the settled custom in Europe and America. Since it is an established custom, it is necessary, in order to be understood, to conform to the usage in speaking with others, also in business, since the custom is fixed by law. But in the observance of the Sabbath, God's order is unchangeable. Those who accept the Sunday festival, which is a man-made institution emanating from Rome, may be allowed to keep it in such a manner as man decrees; but those who keep God's rest day-the memorial of his creative power-will take the day just as God gave it, and not offer a substitute by attaching a portion of two days together. *W.SITI August 11, 1887, page 488.5*

"Piety Without Display" The Signs of the Times, 13, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.
(August 28.-*Matthew 6:1-15.*)

The best manuscripts have "righteousness" instead of "alms," in *verse 1*, and this seems to be the truer meaning of the text, for righteousness includes all right actions, and no good deed of whatever kind should be done for the purpose of winning the applause of men. In the verses following, three divisions of righteousness are considered, namely, almsgiving, prayer, and fasting, none of which should be done with the design of attracting attention. A deed, however right itself, loses all the quality of righteousness when it is done simply for display. This is evident from the statement that those who do thus have no reward from God. Ostentatious piety is not piety and all, but it is simply an exhibition of selfishness. It is a fact that there may be as much of selfishness displayed in the giving of alms as in the withholding of them.*SITI August 11, 1887, page 490.1*

"Therefore when thou doest thine alms, do not sound a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward." This does not mean, as a careless reader might suppose, that they shall have a reward, or that a certain kind of reward is in store for them, but that they already have their reward. The new version expresses the exact idea in the words, "They have received their reward." They gave alms to be seen of men; men sought them, and that constitutes their reward; it is all the reward they wanted.*SITI August 11, 1887, page 490.2*

The command in *verse 3* coincides with the exhortation of Paul and in *Romans 12:8*: "He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity;" and again with his statement in *2 Corinthians 9:7*: "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of the necessity; for God loveth a cheerful giver." The man who gives liberally, with a sincere motive, will not seek for the applause of men. On the contrary, he will rather avoid public notice, because, by measuring himself by the true standard, he will realize that what he does is in reality very insignificant. Yet insignificant though a deed may be in itself, and hidden from the eye of everybody, it does not escape the eye of God, and the promise is, "Thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly."*SITI August 11, 1887, page 490.3*

The same rule applies to praying. True prayer is the desire of the heart made known to God. In it the person appears as a petitioner making known his urgent wants. Such prayer is always heard; but of those who pray simply an order that others may applaud their piety, or their elegant language, the significant statement is made, "Verily I say unto you, They have their reward." They do not ask with the expectation or with the desire that their petitions shall be granted, and consequently God takes no notice of their prayers. All that they desire from their prayers is to be heard of men, and the fact that men hear them, constitutes the answer to their prayer. Nevertheless, such persons are not mere harmless utterances that passed entirely unnoticed by the Lord; they are violations of the third commandment, which says: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." They constitute the worst kind of profanity, since the petitioners use the name of the Lord to

exalt themselves. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 490.4*

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter it into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father, which is in secret; and thy Father which see if in secret shall reward thee openly." This must be understood as a principle rather than an explicit command for every occasion of prayer. It does not mean that it is wrong to pray in public, but that one should not pray in public for the sake of publicity. We have in the Bible many instances of public prayer: Solomon prayed before the thousands assembled at the dedication of the temple. *2 Chronicles 6:12, 13*. The Levites prayed publicly, as recorded in *Nehemiah 9:4-38*. When Paul separated from the Ephesian brethren he prayed with them all. *Acts 20:36*. He also gave thanks to God in the presence of all the passengers and crew on his notable sea voyage to Rome. *Acts 27:35*. And Christ himself prayed with his disciples many times, and at the grave of Lazarus he prayed not only in the presence of his disciples, but of a great company of Jews. Moreover, in the *fourteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians*, we have explicit instructions concerning public prayer. All of these things show that public prayer is not only not forbidden, but is enjoined as a duty. But even in public prayer, if it is sincere prayer, the spirit of privacy is maintained, for the individual is as it were shut in with God, and loses thought, to a certain extent, of those who are present. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 490.5*

One of the most comforting promises in the Bible is given in this connection to those who pray in secret, namely, "Thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." This seems to be an unconditional promise; for sincere prayer, asking in the name of Jesus for those things which a person really needs, will always be heard answered, and it is not to be presumed that one would go by himself to engage in prayer with any other than a sincere motive. The prayer is made in secret, but the reward is open. Men may know nothing of the agonizing petitions, but they cannot fail to see the grace which is abundantly bestowed in consequence. It may not be amiss, however, in this connection, to state that prayer is not necessarily secret because the individual prays in a room by himself. We have known people to make a great display of their "secret devotions." They were careful to let people know when they retired for prayer, and very often if such announcement was unnecessary, because there voice would be raised to such a pitch that everybody in and about the house *must* hear. We can see no difference between such prayer and prayer upon the street corner. Of course there is no wrong attached to the individual if someone chances to over hear his prayer; but he who prays professedly in secret, but with the expectation that others shall notice prayer, comes very far from obeying the injunction of the Saviour, "When thou prayest thou shalt not be as the hypocrites." *SITI August 11, 1887, page 490.6*

In the seventh verse our Saviour teaches that mere words do not constitute prayer. God is not moved by the eloquence of man, but by his needs, and a man's real need may often be expressed better in few words than in many. The heathen, we are told, thought that they should be heard for their much of the speaking. Examples of this are found in *1 Kings 18:26* and *Acts 19:34*. Some even have carried this matter of vain repetition to such a pitch that they use what is called a prayer-wheel. Writing off the petition, they fasten it to the rim of the wheel, which they cause to revolve for rapidly before their idol, every revolution being a prayer. The difference between this sort of prayer and many prayers of professed Christians is only in degree. In Catholic catechisms and books of religious instruction, we find vain repetitions actually enjoined. The multiplied repetition of *Ave Maria* or the *Pater Noster* is counted as a great virtue, and the one who says the most prayers supposed to be the most pious. But such prayer, notwithstanding the fact that the Lord's Prayer itself is repeated, are destitute of any semblance of real prayer. A parrot might be taught to repeat the Lord's Prayer, and he might mutter it over a thousand times a day, and yet there would be no prayer in it. The unreasonableness of such vain repetitions is shown by the statement that "Your father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him." It is not necessary for us to pray in order that the Lord they know what we need, but that we may bring ourselves into a proper condition to receive the things which we need. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 490.7*

The question often arises in the minds of some, "What is the use of praying at all?" They argue that we cannot change the mind of God, that praying is useless since God knows what we want before we ask, and, further, that the universe is governed by fixed laws, and that therefore praying will not affect matters in the least. To this last it can be answered that there are no laws which are not subject to God. To say that what we call the laws of nature cannot be changed or suspended if necessary to the answer of prayer, is to say that God is restricted by the things which he rules, which is an absurdity. Moreover, there are instances innumerable in which in direct answer to prayer the laws of nature have been suspended. The raising of the dead is a case in point. In answer to the first objection, it is enough to say that although God desires only the welfare of his creatures, and he knows what they need without being told, he does not force upon people what they do not want, even though they really need it. And when a person who recognizes his need, and really wants that which will supply it, and feels that he cannot get along without it, the natural impulse is to ask for it, and then it is that God gives his special blessings. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 491.1*

Verses 9-13 contained the model prayer. In introducing it the Saviour said, "After this manner therefore pray ye." This indicates not that the prayer which follows is to be invariably used, although it is very often fitting to

use it, but that it should serve as a model for our petitions. Since it is the petition, framed by divine wisdom, it must necessarily and does cover everything which man needs, both temporal and spiritual. It is because of this comprehensiveness that the Lord's Prayer may be repeated by all classes of people, both young and old, in all time. It never grows old. It is the only prayer ever written which was worthy of being repeated by others than the one who composed it. This is because it is the only prayer ever composed for man by a divine being. Praying in which petitions made by men are used, must necessarily be largely mechanical, and therefore destitute of the real essence of prayer, which is the sincere desire of the individual at that present time. When a man is in extremity he will have no difficulty in forming his own petition, and he would have no use for a petition made by someone else. A prayer-book would have been of very little use to Peter when he was sinking in the Sea of Galilee. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 491.2*

From this prayer we learn that we are to come to God not as to a judge or a governor who is to be appeased, but as to a Father who is all sympathy and love. Many people have entertained a wrong idea from the parable of the unjust judge, recorded in *Luke 18:1-7*. The unjust judge at first refused to grant the request of the poor widow, yet he finally granted it because of her importunity. The idea too commonly drawn from this is, that if we persevere in prayer God will relent and answer repetitions; the parable is not designed to compare God with the unjust judge, but to make a contrast. If the unjust judge who neither feared God nor regarded man, would grant the widow's petition, because of her importunity, then most assuredly God will avenge his own elect who cry earnestly unto him. This parable and the first two words of the Lord's Prayer are sufficient in themselves to give Christians the most confidence when they pray. Add to this the fact that we have a merciful and faithful high priest who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and "was tempted in all points like this we are," and we may "come boldly unto the throne of grace, a that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in times of need." *SITI August 11, 1887, page 491.3*

We have seen it stated that the term "Our Father" implies that all men are brethren, because children of the same Father. But this is a mistake. Paul says that we are all by nature the children of wrath "because we are" the children of disobedience. *Ephesians 2:2, 3; 5:6*. And as the devil is the author of sin, Christ directly charged the disobedient Jews with whom he was talking, of being the children of the devil (*John 8:44*); and in *Matthew 13:38-42* he expressly states that those who do iniquity "are the children of the wicked one." The apostle John also speaks of those who keep the commandments, and of those who transgressed them, and says, "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil" (*John 3:10*), thus showing a direct contrast between those who have God for their Father, and those whose father is Satan. Moreover, we learned in *Romans 8:14-17* and *Galatians 4:4-7* that people become the children of God by adoption, and that the mark or seal of adoption is the Holy Spirit; but if they were by nature the children of God, they would not need to be adopted. Paul also declares that "if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." *SITI August 11, 1887, page 491.4*

"Thy kingdom come." This is nothing less than a prayer for Christ's second coming, for his coming and kingdom are associated together. *2 Timothy 4:1*. When he was on earth, Christ told his disciples, who thought that his kingdom should immediately appear, that he was like a nobleman who "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return" (*Luke 19:11, 12*), thus indicating his return to Heaven to receive his kingdom, and his second coming to gather the subjects of it. In harmony with this we find in *Daniel 7:13, 14* a prophetic description of Christ appearing before the father and receiving "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." And Christ himself said that when he should come in his glory with all his holy angels with him, then would be the time that he should sit upon the throne of his glory, and that he would then say to the righteous, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." *Matthew 25:31-34*. This kingdom is entirely distinct from the kingdom of glory, upon the throne of which God the Father sits, and before which Christ ministers as priest. That kingdom has already come, and if that were the kingdom referred to, in the Lord's Prayer, it would be out of place to use that petition. But the kingdom referred to is the one of which the faithful followers of God are at present only heirs, waiting for the promised possession. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 491.5*

"Thy will be done in earth, as it is in Heaven." The will of God is simply the law of God, see *Psalms 40:8* and *Romans 2:17-20*, where we learn that those who know the will of God are they who are instructed of the law. How the will of God is done in Heaven is told in *Psalms 103:20*: "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, harkening unto the voice of his word." When the will of God is done on earth as it is in heaven, it will be when all the works of the devil had been destroyed, and when the new heavens and the new earth have been given, wherein righteousness shall dwell. Then will be fulfilled the words of the prophet: "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." *Isaiah 60:21*. Therefore the uttering of this part of the Lord's Prayer, if the petitioner is sincere, indicates a complete submission to the will of God, and an earnest desire to keep every portion of the ten commandments. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 491.6*

"And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." In this is implied what is plainly stated in *Matthew 6:14*,

15: "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." Therefore it is utterly useless for any one to use this prayer, or to expect God to pardon his sins, unless he freely forgives all who have trespassed against him. Paul says (*Ephesians 4:32*), "Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, for giving one another, even as God for Christ's sake have forgiven you." *SITI August 11, 1887, page 491.7*

This is the merest glance at the Lord's Prayer, but it is all that we have the space for. To give it any adequate study, not less than an entire lesson should be spent upon each clause of the prayer. But perhaps even with this glance some may see a depth of meaning in the prayer which they have never before realized, and may be led to study it more carefully until they can pray it "with the spirit and with the understanding." *W.SITI August 11, 1887, page 491.8*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

The dispatches state that the Pope has sent an autograph letter to the Emperor William in reply to a letter recently received from him. Nor is it forgotten to give the highly interesting information that "both letters are couched in very affecting terms." "Very affecting" indeed, we have no doubt! Behold how these innocents love one another! *SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.1*

The rector of one of the Episcopal Churches of San Francisco preached a few Sundays ago on "The Mission of Beauty." Just what connection this has with the Gospel, we cannot discover, for we read of the Founder of the gospel that "he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him." From the list of pulpit topics which we occasionally see, we should judge that the Bible is almost out of date. Yet there are people who can still find "wondrous things" in the word of God. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.2*

The brethren in California will notice that the time of camp-meeting is changed from September 22 to October 3, to October 6-17. This postponement was made in order that we might be sure of the presence and help of Brother and Sister White, who could give us no assurance of being present earlier. We feel sure that the certainty of their presence will ensure a full attendance from all parts of the State. We do not apprehend any serious inconvenience on account of the lateness of the meeting, for the weather will be no colder then than in September, and the liability of an early rain is not much greater. At any rate, none should be deterred from coming to the meeting, by the possibility of a little physical discomfort. Come expecting nothing but good, and you will not be disappointed. The meeting will be in Oakland, but the site has not yet been decided upon. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.3*

The new meeting-house at Healdsburg was dedicated Sunday, July 31. There was a good attendance of the citizens of the place, also of our own people. The sermon was preached by Elders J. N. Loughborough; the dedicatory prayer was made by Elder J. O. Corliss. Meetings were held beginning Friday evening and continuing day and evening till Sunday night. Good impressions were made in favor of the truth, and arrangements have been made by the church to have preaching regularly on Sunday evening until our State camp-meeting. They have now a most excellent house, the largest of the kind north of San Francisco, a place where it is a comfort and a pleasure to go. There is nothing fancy about the building, and nothing elegant-except its plainness-and we do not think we have ever seen a house more convenient in all its arrangements. Not only will the house be a great help in the work and service of the church, but it is an immense advantage in the college work. For two years the college has been cramped in its energies, and crippled in efficiency, for lack of room. Now the Sabbath-school department of the meeting-house will be used for classes in the school work and will afford ample room for all purposes. We congratulate the California Conference and the Healdsburg Church and College that they have such a comfortable, commodious, and convenient place of worship and for work. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.4*

The Rome correspondent of the *Catholic Mirror*, writing under date of July 12, says:-*SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.5*

"Monsignor Ruffo and his companions were well received in England, as you know from the reports of the English press. Mgr. Ruffo is convinced that the time is not distant when an amicable arrangement will be made between the English Government and the Papacy and official representatives accredited from both. The Queen was especially kind to the Papal envoy, and assured them that she remembered with great pleasure the visit made by the present Pope to Windsor [before he became Pope] after completing his mission in Belgium." *SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.6*

We have no doubt at all that the convictions of Mgr. Ruffo are well founded. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.7*

Not long since at an installation service in one of the Central States, a minister preach or read word for word a sermon which was preached in the first Congregational Church in Chicago, by the Rev. Dr. Noble, and published in the *Homiletic Monthly* for March, 1880. Strangely enough, in that stolen sermon were the following words:-*SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.8*

"There are the trades and professions-each with its distinctive code. There is a railroad ethic, and there is a tradesmen ethic, and there is a house builders ethic, and there is the newspaper ethic, ... and men are all the time dropping down into the narrow schemes of morals, and estimating conduct, not by the eternal rule of right, God's will, but by some current custom, or miserable conventionalism, or low cunning expediency. I say to a man, why do you adulterate these goods? Why do you weave shoddy into these clothes? Why do you peg shoddy into those shoes? Why stamp your flour with a false brand, and put a label on the silk and the hat and the coat that you sell? His answer is, they all do it; it is one of the tricks of the trade, and something of this sort has to be done to make a living."*SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.9*

This matter of plagiarism is getting so common that it will soon be pertinent to inquire, what is the code of the clerical profession? A man who could steal a sermon which itself condemned stealing, must have very little moral sensibility? And what can be expected of the people whose teachers are so morally obtuse? "Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my words everyone from his neighbor." *Jeremiah 23:36.SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.10*

The following question and answer we take partly from the *New York Christian Advocate*:-*SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.11*

"*Question*-Do you suppose that Lazarus remembered his experience in the other world after being raised from the dead?"*SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.12*

"*Answer*-You ask us what we 'suppose.' We suppose, first, that all inquiries on a subject of that kind are useless; we suppose, second, however, that they will be made to the end of time; third, we suppose that Lazarus did not remember his experience in the other world, because we suppose that he was dead in the same sense that a man who is drowned is dead before he is brought to life, and that he never would have come to life without our Lord's voice or some miraculous power; but that he was dead in the sense that his spirit was permanently and entirely free from the body we don't suppose, and therefore we suppose he did not know anything during the interval. And, finally, we don't suppose that you will agree with this view.*SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.13*

"N. B. The longer we live the less we suppose."*SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.14*

This is a much better answer than we expected to find in the *Advocate*. But the editor of the *Advocate* has evidently not yet live long enough to get over making foolish suppositions. For to suppose that a man who was so dead that nothing less than the voice of Jesus could bring him to life, was simply suffering from suspended animation, as in the case of a person nearly dead from drowning, is extremely foolish; and to suppose that the spirit had not left the body of a man who has been buried four days, and whose body had decomposed till it was offensive, is downright absurdity. More than this, it is directly opposed to the divine revelation, for Christ said plainly, "Lazarus is dead." This "supposition" that Lazarus was unconscious simply because he was not dead enough to be conscious, is worthy only of the pagan philosophy which it seeks to support.*SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.15*

It is announced from Rome that the Pope has decided to take part in the coming political elections in France, and that he hopes to secure a strong party in the Chamber of Deputies. Yes, he hopes to secure a strong party and the Chamber of Deputies so as to hold the balance of power and virtually control legislation in France and control it too from Rome. And France dare resent this political interference of a foreign religious power. How long will it be before the Pope will decide to take part in our political elections? Only let the National Reform religio-political party succeed in its design of establishing a constitutional basis for religious legislation, and this question will answer itself.*SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.16*

"**A Vigorous Statement and Challenge**" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Independent* has been on the fence on the question of probation after death, the editors not seeming to have any fixed opinion of their own; but the publisher, Mr. Henry C. Bowen, has a decided opinion of his own, and he expresses it in a straightforward manner. After giving details of a correspondence between himself and Prof. E. C. Smythe, in which it appears that Professor Smythe could not, in answer to Mr. Bowen's request, give, without comment, any Scripture texts in support of this theory, Mr. Bowen says:-*SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.17*

"We cannot forbear saying, in this connection, that in all of our acquaintance with the secret movements and sometimes strange performances of men connected with our various churches, sects, and denominations, and all the excitement and maneuverings of the politicians in our heated presidential campaigns, and the most hard-fought battles of the great thirty-years antislavery conflict, in the desperate and ceaseless efforts of men in all directions in the pursuit of worldly gain, we have never seen a more senseless, uncalled-for agitation than the one started a year ago by the Andover teachers and speculators in regard to future probation." *SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.18*

He then called on them to "show any warrant in the Bible for the mischief they have done and are doing, or for the special help and encouragement they are now giving to the teachers and preachers of universalism and other isms, indulging downright infidelity, or for the pernicious hopes given by them directly and indirectly, to the unconverted, the world over." It is safe to presume that hereafter the editors of the *Independent* will know what position to take concerning the Andover speculations on probation after death. *SITI August 11, 1887, page 496.19*

August 18, 1887

"The World Is Round" The Signs of the Times, 13, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

We do not design to make an argument to prove this statement, for we think that there are so few who would deny it that we can safely take it for granted. And yet we are occasionally led to believe that there are some people to whom this statement is news. We have but recently received a letter from a gentleman in Iowa, who seems to have but just heard that the world is round, and who has not yet fully waked up to a realizing sense of all that that implies. As his letter is a very fair sample of the trouble in which many people find themselves when the Sabbath of the fourth commandment is brought to their attention, we publish it in full:-*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.1*

DEAR EDITOR: I am an occasional reader of your paper. I indorse your position against the worldliness of professing Christians, and temperance reform. I also believe in the near approach of the second coming of Christ. But as yet I cannot accept your views on the fourth commandment. Thus far some physical facts stand in the way of my believing that the seventh day of the week instead of the seventh part of time is intended by that command. As you kindly answer all reasonable questions, giving light to those who sit in darkness, I take the liberty to address you. As the Master did, I will form a parable and state the case, and you will have the goodness to help me out of the difficulty you think I am in.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.2*

There are three brothers who live in the same town, Peter, James, and John; they are good Adventists, and keep the seventh day as their Sabbath. Peter and James desire to see the world, so they start out to circumnavigate the globe, while John remains at home. Peter starts east and James west. Each keeps his course, counts his weeks, and observes strictly his seventh-day Sabbath till he gets back to his native town. The three brothers meet and talk over the fourth commandment. They discover to their sorrow and astonishment that each is keeping a different day. Each one accuses his brethren of changing the day.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.3*

Peter, who sailed east and carried his time carefully and correctly, is keeping the first day of our week, or Sunday; James, who sailed west and carried his time carefully and correctly, is keeping the sixth day of our week, or Friday; while John alone is keeping the day they all observed before they parted. Now which one is keeping the right day? If we say John, then why haven't Peter and James, who observed correctly each succeeding seventh-day Sabbath on shipboard, as much right to their days as John, who observed his on land?*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.4*

If your Sabbath views are correct, these physical facts can be shown to harmonize with them, for all natural truth is in harmony with revealed truth, because all truth is God's truth. If this harmony cannot be shown, I shall still feel that my first-day Sabbath is as good as yours. Yours for the truth. A. S.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.5*

We cannot think that we mistake when we judge that this brother has but recently heard that the world was round, for although he speaks in the beginning of his letter of the seventh part of time, the closing sentence shows that the seventh part of time which he observes always comes on the first day of the week. We take it, therefore, that he is a professed Christian and a conscientious observer of Sunday. And yet until he read in the SIGNS OF THE TIMES that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh day of the week, or Saturday, he never imagined that the rotundity of the earth would interfere in any way whatever with the keeping of the first day of the week. How is it that people will keep Sunday all their lives, and will send missionaries to the opposite side of the globe to teach the heathen that they must keep Sunday, but as soon as the Sabbath of the Lord is broached they declare that *it* cannot be kept because the world is round? Is the world round only when a person tries to keep the Sabbath, and flat at all other times? Is it not just as wrong for the first-day missionary who goes to China, India, or Africa, as it is for the seventh-day keeper who goes around the world? The simple fact that people do keep the first day of the week in every part of the world, should be a sufficient answer to the objection that people cannot keep the Sabbath on a round world. Indeed, it should prevent such an objection from ever being made.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.6*

But since our brother has used a parable, we feel like adopting it and improving upon it a little. The three brothers of whom he speaks were all born on the same day. With this correction we will adopt a parable as he has given it. Peter has just come home from his journey eastward around the world, and having gained one day is one day older than his brother John, who stayed at home. James, who has just returned from his journey westward around the world, has lost a day and is keeping Friday, and so he is one day younger than his brother John, who stayed at home, and two days younger than Peter, who went around the world the other way. Now if our friend will accept this conclusion of the parable, we shall conclude that he is more puzzled over the fact that the world is round than any person whom we ever saw. But we believe that he will say that it

is impossible that Peter should have gained a day on his brother John, and James should have lost one, and that their relative ages must be the same as before they started. But if this is so, his supposition concerning the Sabbath must be abandoned.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.7*

As a matter of fact, there is no trouble whatever in circumnavigating the globe in any direction. To say that one cannot keep Saturday if he goes to the other side of the globe, is equivalent to saying that they do not have the days of the week over there. But we have evidence from history that people on the other side of the world knew something of the days of the week even before America was discovered. It is true that it is not a given part of the day at the same moment all the world, just as it is true that no man can be all over the world at the same instant. But as the man can only be in one place at a time, all he has to do is keep the Sabbath when it comes to him, wherever he is. If anybody should start out to travel, with the idea that when it is noon in his native town, it is noon at the same instant all over the world, or, in other words, that the sun rises and sets at that same instant all around the globe, he would find out his mistake before he had traveled a thousand miles. He would find that he would have to set his watch ahead a little every day if he were going east, or back if he were going west.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.8*

The day is formed by the revolution of the earth. So far as the formation of days is concerned, the sun is fixed; but as a given portion of the earth in its revolution from west to east comes into the light of the sun, the sun is said to rise at that place, and when it comes into the shadow, the sun is said to set. Now if the person is traveling westward, he is going with the sun, and so he will see it above the horizon each day longer than if he remained in one place; while the one who goes east, goes with the motion of the earth, and so earth passes into the shade quicker and has less of the sunshine in the day, than if he remained at home. Therefore the one who goes west must set his watch back a few minutes each day, and the one who goes east must set his forward, so that he will be in harmony with the local time wherever he may be. And when both return home, having kept their time accurately, they find themselves perfectly in harmony with those who have remained there. Each one has kept his Sabbath, when he came to it, from sunset till sunset; and this is all that is required. If the commandment required the seventh part of time, this would not meet the demand, for when a man is traveling westward, it is longer from sunset to sunset than when he is traveling eastward. In short, all that the commandment requires is to keep the seventh day of the week wherever a man may be. This can be done in China as well as in America, and it can be done in any intermediate place between America and China, whether we go east or west.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.9*

If this were an age in which a trip of fifty miles from home would be a great wonder, the objection which our brother has made might seem plausible, but when a trip around the world is a thing so common as not to attract any attention, and is accomplished every year by thousands and tens of thousands of people, and yet no individual has found his reckoning out of harmony with the reckoning of those whom he meets in any part of the world, the objection is simply absurd.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.10*

To conclude: The Lord made the earth and therefore we cannot doubt that he knew that it is round. He also made man, as the apostle says, "to dwell on all the face of the earth." *Acts 17:26*. He also instituted the Sabbath, declaring it to be a fixed, definite day, and commanded men to observe it. Christ says that the Sabbath was made for man (*Mark 2:27*), meaning all mankind. Therefore we must conclude that God designed the Sabbath to be kept by men on every part of the round world. If God gave mankind such a commandment, knowing all the time that the world was round, it is nothing else but charging God with folly to say that man cannot keep the Sabbath of the Lord on the Lord's earth.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.11*

We trust that our friend will cling to his statement that all truth is God's truth, and that since the God who made the world also made the Sabbath, there can be no physical facts to interfere with the keeping of the day.
W. SITI August 18, 1887, page 502.12

"Punctuation and Inspiration" The Signs of the Times, 13, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

Not infrequently we find people who seem to think that everything which may be found between the lives of the Bible is inspired. Some people think that the references under the verses are a sort of inspired comment, forgetting that they only serve as a miniature concordance, and were never put into the Bible until A.D. 1611, and the last of them not till 1785. There are others who think that Usher's Chronology, which is placed in many Bibles, is inspired, and who would think it heresy to teach that Christ was crucified in the year 31, when the date in the margin of the Bible says 33. Indeed, we have seen some who seem to think that the pictures in the large family Bibles are inspired, and who cannot be made to believe that when Jacob fled from home he was an old man nearly eighty years old, because in the family Bible illustration of Jacob's dream he is represented as a curly-headed little boy sleeping upon a rock.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 504.1*

But the most common error of this sort is in supposing that punctuation of the Bible is inspired. A friend who

writes to us from Illinois seems to labor under this misapprehension. He says that he has been reading the SIGNS for some time, and has had the most implicit confidence in it until he read the article in the SIGNS of May 26, entitled, "What and Where Is Paradise?" In that he found that in our quotation of *Luke 23:43*, we placed, after the comma after the word "to-day," whereas in the ordinary version it is after the word "thee." Again he notices that in *2 Corinthians 12:2-4* the Revised Version and King James's Version each have the text punctuated differently, while the text as we quote it is punctuated differently from both. Consequently, our correspondent says, "Now if you are right, it will be easy for you to explain; if you do not explain, the conclusion will be that you have punctuated it to bring out your own idea regardless of truth." *SITI August 18, 1887, page 504.2*

We are very happy to explain for the benefit of our brother and others who may be similarly troubled. We will consider the last text first. On this he can certainly have no more fault to find with us than with the revisers, for, as he himself says, the punctuation is not the same in the two versions. We will quote the text just as it is in both of the versions and just as it appeared in the SIGNS; for thereby a point may be illustrated. King James's Version has it as follows: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) how that he was caught up in the Paradise," etc. *SITI August 18, 1887, page 504.3*

The Revised Version has it thus: "I know a man in Christ, fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not; God knoweth), such a one caught up even to the third heaven. And I know such a man (whether in the body, or apart from the body, I know not; God knoweth), how that he was caught up in the Paradise," etc. *SITI August 18, 1887, page 504.4*

Although there is some difference in the marks of punctuation used in those two verses, there is no difference in the sense. Punctuation marks are not used so freely as they were formerly, and the colon is seldom used in ordinary sentences. According to modern usage when words are inclosed in parentheses, the necessary marks of punctuation are placed *after* the marks of parentheses, and not *within*, and so the New Version conforms to this usage. All the other difference is that the New Version has a comma, instead of a semicolon, after the parenthesis as in the Old. The text as it appeared in the SIGNS was punctuated the same as in the New Version with the exception of the semicolon being used after the parenthesis instead of the comma. But this change was simply incidental, and it was not known at the time that there was any difference; but the matter is of no consequence anyway, as the meaning is not affected in the least by the difference in the punctuation. *SITI August 18, 1887, page 504.5*

All the readers of the Bible should understand that at the time that the Bible was written, there were no marks of punctuation, and the words in the sentences were not separated by spaces as we now have them. For example, the first verse of the book of John was something like this:-*SITI August 18, 1887, page 504.6*

INTHEBEGINNINGWASTHEWORDANDTHEWORDWASWITHGODANDTHEWORDWASGODTHESAMEWAS
August 18, 1887, page 504.7

The American Encyclopedia says: "The modern points came into use very gradually after the invention of printing, the comma, parentheses, notes of interrogation, and period, being the earliest introduced, and the note of exclamation last. It was not till sixteen centuries that an approach was made to the regular system by the Manutii of Venice." *SITI August 18, 1887, page 504.8*

Modern punctuation has been a thing of growth. The marks have been invented and placed where the sense seemed to require them, to make it easier for the reader, and it follows, therefore, that punctuation which vary in some instances according as those who translated the Bible differed in their ideas of its meaning. In some instances the punctuation has been changed. *Hebrews 10:12* was formerly punctuated thus: "And this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God." This would indicate that after making a sacrifice for sins, Christ sat down at the right hand of God never to leave that place. But this idea is contradicted by the whole tenor of the Scriptures, which teach that Christ is going to stand up and come to this earth again, and finally to reign upon this earth; therefore the punctuation has been changed so as to present the true idea, namely, that when Christ had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, that is, a sacrifice once for all, he sat down at the right hand of God. This change has been made not to conform to anyone's theory of truth, but to the plainly expressed truth of the Bible. *SITI August 18, 1887, page 504.9*

Again, *Matthew 19:28* was once in some Bibles punctuated thus: "Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This punctuation would make the text mean that the disciples had followed Christ in the regeneration, that is, that they had followed Christ in being born again; but such an idea is monstrous, as it would indicate that Christ, like the disciples, had been a sinner and had been obliged to be born again, and so in our version the comma is placed after the word "me"

instead of after "regeneration," so that the text expresses what Christ meant, that those who followed him, should in the regeneration, when Christ comes, that is, when all things are made new, sit upon twelve thrones.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 504.10*

So in quoting *Luke 23:43*, we placed the comma after the word "to-day," not to bring out our own idea regardless of truth, but to make the text express what is evidently the truth, and make it consistent with the plain declarations of Scripture. As it stands in the Authorized Version, it seems to indicate that Christ told the penitent thief that he should be with him in Paradise that very day on which they were hanging on the cross. But this would be to make Christ contradict himself, because three days later he said (*John 20:17*) that he had not yet ascended to God, and he would not receive the adoration of Mary until he had ascended; but God's throne is in Paradise, therefore, when Christ said that he had not ascended to the Father, it was equivalent to saying that he had not ascended to Paradise. But since he had not ascended the Paradise, it is very evident that he could not have told the thief that he would meet him there three days before, because he could not tell an untruth.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 505.1*

Perhaps it will be less objectionable if, instead of saying that we changed the punctuation of the verse, we imagine ourselves living before the art of punctuation was invented. Let us strike out all punctuation from the verse, and then we shall have it just as it was written in the inspired historian. Literally thus:-*SITI August 18, 1887, page 505.2*

" VERILY I SAY TO THEE TODAY WITH ME THOU SHALT BE IN THE PARADISE " *August 18, 1887, page 505.3*

Now we read it through, and, being acquainted with the teaching of the Bible, namely, that Christ did not ascend to Paradise until three days after the crucifixion, and, moreover, that he could not have ascended until the third day, when he rose from the dead, because the dead know not anything and have no power of locomotion, we know better than to place the comma after the word thee. We therefore consider the circumstances under which the words were uttered. We consider that Christ was hanging upon the cross, condemned as a malefactor, despised by almost everybody, and his teachings doubted even by his own disciples, with no earthly prospect that any of his predictions could ever be verified, and we see how natural that Christ in making the promise to the thief should put emphasis upon the word "to-day," Verily I say unto thee *to-day*, notwithstanding these untoward circumstances, and that all my hopes and predictions seem to have come to naught, even *to-day*, I say unto you, that ye shall be with me in Paradise. But this, the only natural and consistent view of the text, would force us, in punctuating it, to place the comma after the word "to-day," because the voice, following the obvious meaning of the passage, makes a pause there whether one is indicated or not.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 505.4*

It is unfortunate that the translators of the Bible did not have a perfect and consistent view of its teachings. And yet we do not know but that it was providential, for there are but only a few passages where the meaning is in any way obscured by the translation or by the punctuation, and the meaning of those few can be easily determined from parallel passages; and the fact that the nature of man, the sleep of the dead, the seventh-day Sabbath, and similar unpopular truths, stand forth in bold relief in a Bible translated by those who believed none of those truths, makes it far more evident that they are unquestioned Bible truths, than if the Bible had been translated by men predisposed in favor of them. W.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 505.5*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

Elder E. J. Waggoner, and Mrs. Jessie F. Waggoner, the Secretary of the State Sabbath school association, left Oakland August 10, for Eureka, Cal., to attend the Humboldt County camp-meeting *SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.1*

Prussia's hobnobbing with the Papacy has begun already to bear the unfailing fruit of a legal recognition of Romanism. A Lutheran minister in Prussia was recently sentenced to nine months' imprisonment for "insulting" the Romish Church. The insult consisted in publishing a pamphlet in which he remarked that the Romish apostasy is "built upon superstition and idolatry." And for such "insulting" remarks as this, to prison for nine months their author had to go. And this in the land of Luther! Let Prussia be called no more a Protestant country. She has been surrendered bodily to the Papacy, and Rome rules there, and that in Rome's own wicked way.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.2*

We sometimes hear the expression used that "good may come out of evil." This is very true, if we see the word "evil" in the sense of trouble, and not in the sense of sin. Affliction and trouble are often called evil, and in this sense good may come out of evil, "for our light of affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." Again we read that "tribulation worketh patience; and

patience, experience; and experience, hope;" and that chastisement which at the time is very grievous, afterwards yields the peaceable fruits of righteousness to them who are exercised thereby. And again, that "all things work together for good to them that love God." But from evil which is sin no good can possibly come. Sin has no manner of connection with good. From sin only sin can come. So none need console themselves with the thought, if they have done wrong, that good may come out of it. There is a mercy for the sinner, and where sin of bounds, grace does much more abound, and so good may come after evil, if the sinner exercises repentance towards God, and faith in his Son Jesus Christ. But the good can come only after the sin has been put away, and it comes not because of the evil, but in spite of it. "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid." *SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.3*

An exchange says:-*SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.4*

"The law cannot make a man moral, but it can make him dreadfully uncomfortable when he is immoral." *SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.5*

Well, that depends. It is true that the law cannot make a man moral; but if it is the law of the land that is referred to, as we suppose it is, then we know that a man may be terribly immoral without suffering the least inconvenience from the law. The trouble is, people have a very low standard of morality. If a man does no open violence, or cause any serious inconvenience to his neighbor, he is called a moral man; whereas, a man may do nothing for which the law could molest him, and still be as corrupt as the grave. It should be understood that civil laws cannot make men moral, and are not for the purpose of punishing immortality, but simply for the purpose of protecting the rights of people; in short, to deter men from acting in an uncivil matter. *SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.6*

Remarking on the late train robbery on the Southern Pacific Railroad, the San Francisco *Chronicle* says the robbers were successful "mainly, it would seem, because of the lack of resistance on the part of the engineer." So far as the *Chronicle's* own report in the same paragraph, that the robbers had turned the switch which threw the engine off the track, turned it over, and threw the engineer and fireman down an embankment fifty feet, we are rather inclined to think the engineers "lack of resistance" to the robbers was identifiable, and that the *Chronicle* was extravagant in its demands. If the editor of the *Chronicle* was in charge of an engine which should be upset by robbers and be thrown fifty feet down a bank, we have an idea that just at that particular moment even his resistance to the attacking robbers would not be particularly vigorous nor exceptionally gallant. "It would seem" so at least. The *Chronicle* went a long way to find something to find fault with. *SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.7*

About the middle of July, Mrs. Logan, the widow of General John A. Logan, was thrown from a buggy. The first dispatches stated that she was not seriously hurt, but a late report from her physician shows it to have been a very painful accident. He says: "Mrs. Logan's injuries are very serious. On the 25th ult., for the first time since the injury, she was turned upon her right side, with soft pads under her injured left arm. Her left shoulder was crushed by the wheel of the buggy running over it. The whole arm to the elbow is blackened from bruises, and the forearm to the wrist is slightly injured. Her head was stepped upon on its top and left side, the horse's shod foot tearing the scalp loose in a concentric shape, making a wound three and a half inches in length to the skull. The skull is uninjured. She has suffered exceeding pain at the shoulder and along the course of the arm. We rejoice to say she is improving in every respect." *SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.8*

Nearly every Protestant paper in the country, whether religious or secular, has confessed it to have been the duty of Dr. McGlynn to go to Rome when he was commanded by the Pope to do so, to answer for his opinions that were already condemned. The truth is, that if he had gone to Rome, he could, and no doubt would, have been kept there forever, and that too in a dungeon, just as likely as not, unless he should have recanted. And even had he recanted he would never have been allowed to return to a free America. The chances are ten to one that had Dr. McGlynn gone to Rome he would never have been directly heard of more. The *Christian Advocate* (N.Y.) has come nearer to the truth in the matter than any other paper we have seen. It says:-*SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.9*

"Once in Rome he could have been kept there indefinitely. He could be assigned to duty in any part of the world; could be cut loose from his life-work, and removed from all his association and centers of influence, and be compelled to begin a new career under a ban." *SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.10*

But Mr. McGlynn knows Rome's methods too well to be caught in the toils of the Romish Inquisition, and he still breathes the free air of yet free America. But how long America shall remain free from Rome's pernicious power is a question. With the National Reform Party and its allies endeavoring to create a constitutional basis for religious legislation in national affairs, and bidding for Rome's influence to help secure it; and with the press of the country siding with Rome in a controversy involving the right of free thought and free speech of an American citizen; the prospect is not very reassuring. *SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.11*

The Inquiry columns of the religious papers furnish some rather queer matter occasionally. Here is a question and answer that appeared in the *Christian Advocate* of August 4-J. M. Buckley, D. D. editor:-*SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.12*

Q. 2435.-Can the dead perceive what is going on upon the earth?*SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.13*

A.-If we knew, we should hasten to publish the information, for we should be the only possessor of it on earth.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.14*

P.S. The Bible says that there is joy in the presence of the angels in heaven over the conversion of sinners, but no details are given as to how the information reaches them.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.15*

"If we knew." But why is it that he does not know? The Bible says as plainly as language can be expressed, "The dead know not anything... Neither have they any more a portion forever in anything that is done under the sun." And again, "his sons, to honor and he knoweth it not; they are brought low and they perceiveth it not of them." Here then is this correspondent's question directly and plainly answered, but the *Advocate* can only answer, "If we knew." Again we say, why is it that the editor does not know? Is it because he does not know that these verses are in the Bible? or is it because he does not believe these words even though they be the word of God? We are inclined to think it is the latter, because the doctrine of the immortality of the soul does not allow a consistent belief of the words of the Bible.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.16*

So much for the *Advocate's* "answer;" but what is meant by the "P.S."? A correspondent asks, "Can *the dead* perceive what is going on upon the earth?" And he is informed that "there is joy in the presence of *the angels in Heaven* over the conversion of sinners." Does the *Advocate* mean to convey the idea that dead people are angels? or that the company of the angels is made up of dead people? What a queer idea that questioner must have had, in the first place, to ask, "Can *the dead* perceive?" If a person can perceive at all, it seems to us that that would be pretty good evidence that he is *not dead*.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.17*

A religious exchange says: "Unless the churches in the United States gain as much as ten million members during the year 1887, there will be more unconverted people among us January, 1888, than there are now." There probably will be anyway; for unconverted people are coming to this country, as well as growing up in this country, continually, and, unfortunately, the making of church members is not necessarily equivalent to the making of converts.*SITI August 18, 1887, page 512.18*

August 25, 1887

"Not 'A Daniel Come to Judgment'" The Signs of the Times, 13, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

The state of Louisiana has, in common with many other States, been doctoring its Sunday laws, and now has a law requiring that, with certain exceptions, all places of business shall be closed from 12 o'clock on Saturday night until 12 o'clock on Sunday night. A case recently came before the Supreme Court of Louisiana in which the law was claimed to be unconstitutional. The court held the law to be valid, and the following is a portion of the opinion delivered by the Judge:-*SITI August 25, 1887, page 518.1*

"We take occasion promptly to say that if the object of law were to compel the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, we would not hesitate to declare it to be violative of the above constitutional prohibition. It would violate equally the religious liberty of the Christian, the Jew, and the infidel, none of whom can be compelled by law to comply with any merely religious observance whether it accords with his faith and conscience or not. With rare exceptions, the American authorities concur in this view.... The statute is to be judged of precisely as if it had selected for the day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be question, because in the exercise of a wide discretion, it has chosen that day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be questioned, because in the exercise of a wide discretion, it was chosen that day which a majority of the inhabitants of this state, under the sanctions of their religious faith, already voluntarily observed as a day of rest."*SITI August 25, 1887, page 518.2*

The New York *Independent* quotes this, and adds the following words of approval:-*SITI August 25, 1887, page 518.3*

"This is an exceedingly lucid statement of the theory which underlies all legislation that requires the suspension of ordinary labor on Sunday. The object is not to enforce religious observances of any kind, but simply to establish a uniform day of rest for the general good of the whole people; and this is no interference with the religious rights of anybody."*SITI August 25, 1887, page 518.4*

It may seem very presumptuous for a non-professional man to criticize the opinion of so great a person as a judge of the Supreme Court, but nevertheless we have no hesitation in saying that the opinion quoted is nothing but sophistry, and such sophistry as could be dealt out only by an adept in the art. This we think can easily be made apparent; and it is the more necessary that they should be done, because the Sunday-law mania has now become quite prevalent, and just such sophistical arguments as those quoted above will be relied on in securing the enactment of those laws. These arguments will be used for the reason that they are the best that can be offered in favor of an unjust law, and also simply because they have been used before. Even the Louisiana judge himself did not pretend to originate them, but contented himself with giving the view in which nearly all "American authorities concur." If American legal business were not becoming more a matter of precedent than of common sense, Sunday laws could never be enacted; but the idea seems to be that whatever has been done ought to be done, and precedents for oppressing people under the guise of charity are not wanting.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 518.5*

The claim is made that the Sunday law does not compel the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, and that therefore it cannot be contrary to a constitution which forbids religious tests for office or citizenship. But the fact is, Sunday is *primarily a religious institution*, and its observance cannot be enforced except as such. It cannot be separated from its religious (not *sacred*) character for the purpose of special legislation concerning it. It matters not what such legislation is called, whether a police regulation, or a law in the interests of the workman, it is legislation concerning an institution of the church.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 518.6*

To make it evident that Sunday laws are laws in behalf of religion, three things only need to be borne in mind: 1. Sunday rest originated in the church. Catholics universally claim the church as the sole authority for Sunday observance, and many Protestants agree with them in this. The *Christian at Work* says: "We rest the designation of Sunday solely on the church having set it apart of its own authorities." But if the claims of those who say that Christ and the apostles set the day apart as a day of rest, were true, that would make it emphatically a church institution. 2. The observance of Sunday is generally considered by church people as the essence of religion. In the Sunday law contest in California five years ago, the *Christian Advocate* spoke of Sunday as "the foundation of our holy religion." Regarding Sunday rest as the memorial of the resurrection of Christ, they think that without it there would be no evidence of the truth of the gospel. 3. The churches and the churches alone are at the bottom of all Sunday legislation. No one ever heard of such a thing as a Sunday law being proposed by anybody except a zealous churchman or a deputation of ministers. It is true that, by pretending that Sunday laws are in the interests of labor, they are inducing labor and socialistic organizations to clamor for such laws, but these organizations come in only as allies to the church. Everyone who knows

anything of the history of Sunday legislation, knows that it is *always* instigated by the churches.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 519.1*

Now in the face of these things, to say that Sunday laws do not compel men to observe Sunday as a religious institution, is not only sophistry, but it is positively untruth. Since the day as a day of rest is nothing else but a religious institution, how can it be enforced as anything else but a religious institution? It cannot be enforced as something which it is not. True, it is said that when the State enforces the observance of Sunday, it makes it a civil institution, merely a legal holiday. Well, nobody contends that the State law makes Sunday a religious institution; it is that already. We freely admit that the State law in its behalf is only a civil ordinance, for the State could make nothing else but a civil ordinance; but, mark it well, what we do claim, and what all candid minds must admit to be the truth, is that a State Sunday law is a *civil ordinance* enforcing the observance of a *religious institution*.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 519.2*

Some years ago the city of San Francisco had a notorious mayor, who engaged in certain transactions that were inconsistent with his official position. His defense was that he did those things as an ordinary citizen, and not as mayor. It requires no argument to show the absurdity of such a statement. The man was mayor, and he could not separate himself from his office within the time to which he was elected. But this is just on a par with the argument that Sunday legislation is not the enforcement of a religious institution. If the friends of so-called National Reform admit such a plea, they must be prepared to see it carried out to its legitimate conclusion. They must expect to see the vilest rakes elected to office in their model government, under the plea that they are not bad citizens, but are simply bad men.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 519.3*

If anything further were needed to show the flimsy character of the arguments by which Sunday-law advocates attempt to make it appear that they are not working for an ecclesiastical establishment, it may be found in the last sentence of the judicial opinion first quoted. Said the judge:-*SITI August 25, 1887, page 519.4*

"The statute is to be judged of precisely as if it had selected for the day of rest any day of the week, other than Sunday; and its validity is not to be questioned because, in the exercise of a wise discretion, it has chosen that day which a majority of the inhabitants of this State, under the sanctions of their religious faith, already voluntarily observed as a day of rest."*SITI August 25, 1887, page 519.5*

"A wise discretion," indeed! The State has chosen the day which a large majority of its inhabitants, under the sanctions of their religious faith, who voluntarily observe as a day of rest, and, at the instigation of that majority, has undertaken to enforce its observance as a day of rest, and yet this is no more in the interest of religion than if Monday or Thursday had been chosen! Such a monstrous assertion needs but to be quoted to be refuted. A man must be sadly blinded to put such a statement forth as a sober legal argument, and men must be pre-determined to have Sunday laws or they could not be deceived by it. Suppose that the State had, in the exercise of its "wise discretion," chosen Saturday instead of Sunday; would their not have been protests without number? Indeed there would. People would call it a law in the interest of the Jews and other Sabbatarians, and no argument could convince them to the contrary. "But," says one, "such a law would really be unjust to the great majority who observe Sunday as a day of religious rest." Indeed! Then by the same token a law enforcing Sunday observance is unjust to those who observe Saturday, or who do not choose to observe any set day. The discriminating reader can see that it is the word "majority" which catches the judicial fancy. It seems to be the idea that Sunday legislation cannot be wrong, because the majority favor it. As much as if to say that a thing is necessarily right if it is proposed by a majority of the people. But no majorities can ever make a wrong right, and State laws in behalf of an establishment of religion are always wrong. The question whether or not Sunday ought to be observed as a day of rest, does not enter into the case at all. We believe in the God of the Bible, as the majority of people in this country profess to do, but we should emphatically protest against a State law to compel all people to recognize him as such.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 519.6*

Here is a point that should not be lost sight of: If Sunday laws are not for the purpose of compelling the observance of Sunday as a religious institution, for what purpose are they? The claim is that they are in the interest of humanity, so that laboring men may have the rest which their physical nature imperatively demands. Very well, thus we suppose it will be admitted that is within the province of the State to compel men to observe the laws of there being. Now it is just as certain that man's physical nature requires that he should take a definite amount of sleep every twenty-four hours, far more imperatively than it demands that he shall rest one day in seven. Will our Sunday-law friends admit that the State has any right to decide how many hours a man ought to sleep, and to enact a law compelling every man to sleep at least seven hours out of every twenty-four? Unless they are ready to advocate such a measure as this, let them say nothing more about enforcing Sunday rest on the basis of the necessity of man's physical nature. We have presented this view of the case before, but we do not expect ever to see Sunday-law advocates attempt to meet it.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 519.7*

Now one word concerning the *Independent's* statement that Sunday legislation "is no interference with the religious rights of anybody." We say that it is a positive and unjust interference with the religious rights of everybody who conscientiously observes any day other than Sunday. Here are laboring men who believe that when the fourth commandment says, "The *seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," means just what it says. They are conscientious in their observance of the seventh day of the week; and the needs of their families demand that they should spend the other six days in labor, as the commandment allows. According to the fourth commandment, it is their religious *privilege* to labor six days of the week, just as much as it is their religious *duty* to rest on the seventh. Therefore if the State steps in and *compels* them to rest on another day also, no matter on what grounds the rest is enforced, their religious rights are interfered with. And if these men shall be punished for continuing to make Sunday one of their six working days, their punishment will be an act of religious persecution. No assertions to the contrary can change the truth of this. *SITI August 25, 1887, page 519.8*

From the very nature of the case, Sunday legislation must interfere with the religious rights of some. For, Sunday as a day of rest is beyond dispute a religious institution; legislation enforcing its observance is legislation enforcing an establishment of religion; and when any religious tenet is enforced, the religious rights of all who do not hold that tenet must be interfered with, and oppression must result. *SITI August 25, 1887, page 519.9*

We hope that the people in those States that still allow full liberty of conscience, will take the time and trouble now to become well informed concerning the arguments used in behalf of Sunday laws, and will learn how to expose their fallacy, so that when the Sunday-law mania shall seize their State, as it surely will, they will not allow their liberty to be taken away without making a well-directed, intelligent protest. W. *SITI August 25, 1887, page 519.10*

"British and Foreign Bible Society" The Signs of the Times, 13, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

A retrospect of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the last half century discloses some very encouraging facts. Fifty years ago the annual issues of the Bible, and of portions of it, amounted to 600,000 copies; they now amount to 4,000,000. Half a century ago the cheapest Bible cost 48 cents; now it can be had for 12 cents. Then the cheapest New Testament cost 20 cents; now it can be had for 2 cents. Fifty years ago the Scriptures were published and circulated in 136 languages; that number has been increased to 280, in fact there is only one great language, the Japanese, which has not a complete translation of the Scriptures, and that one will have such a translation before the close of the current year. Altogether these statistics form a perfect fulfillment of the prophecy found in *Daniel 12:4*, that in the time of the end, "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." *SITI August 25, 1887, page 520.1*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

Sisters E. G. White and M. K. White, Elders O. A. Olsen and D. T. Bourdeau, and others from Europe arrived safely at New York, August 11. Elder W. C. White will leave Europe for home about Sept. 1. *SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.1*

The Pope says that "not alone Italy," but "all other nations" "principally owe to the Papacy the civilization they enjoy." Yes, England and the United States, for instance, with Spain and Mexico, or the North of Ireland with the south, bear unmistakable evidence in the case. On a par with this is the statement in the same letter, that justice can never be done "if the Pope is not restored to his incontestable rights indeed temporal sovereignty-rights founded upon the most legitimate and sacred of titles." The right founded upon the "Donation of Constantine" above all in legitimacy and sacredness, of course. *SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.2*

In the *Christian Advocate* of July 21, a certain Rev. J. W. Simpson says:-*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.3*

"We admit immersion to be one mode of baptism, and yet can recall at present only four examples of it in the Scriptures. The first is the deluge; the second, that of Pharaoh's army; the third the case of a man, the leper who was so exceedingly foul that we are not surprised that it took old Jordan to cleanse him; and the fourth was that of a herd of swine which ran violently down a steep place into the sea and perished in the waters." *SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.4*

As a display of downright egotistical ignorance we have never seen that surpassed. Nor is that all. His reference to the swine as an example of a baptism is contemptible, and his reference to the case of Naaman is basely irreverent. *SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.5*

A correspondent, apparently editorial, of the *Christian Union*, says that "Professor Harris is the philosopher of the Concord School *par excellence*... and the opinion is frequently heard that we may yet have an American system of philosophy." It seems that this "American system of philosophy" is embodied in the idea of probation after death. And Professor Harris in his *par excellence* "makes the idea of the cessation of probation annihilate both" Heaven and hell. Then says this admirer of the "philosopher *par excellence*," "This view of Dr. Harris is fully elaborated in his essay on 'The Philosophic Structure of Dante's *Davina Commedia*.' I am not sure that this paper will not prove itself to be one of the most inspiring missionary tracks of the time." Well an American philosophy extracted from Dante's "*Davina Commedia*" may be a very inspiring thing, but it is absolutely certain that such inspiration will never lead men to God or accomplish anything for Christ. Yet this wild nonsense is becoming very popular in the theological circle of which the *Christian Union* forms a part.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.6*

In the *Forum* for July Mr. Grant Allen says:-*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.7*

"Life is merely some particular set of correlated movements, occurring, under the influence of the solar radiation, in a certain group of material bodies on the surface of one small and unimportant planet, in a minor solar system, hidden away on the skirts of a galaxy in some lost quarter of a boundless universe."*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.8*

That is very exact. It is most satisfactorily definite. The *corner* of anything boundless is good, but when it is the corner of a boundless cosmos, and that, too, a lost quarter, and the thing hidden away there beside, then the thought becomes grand. Now with that definition of *life* put the following definition of *death*, by the much admired Professor Drummond-he who was brought all the way from England to help Moody in his missionary training-school:-*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.9*

"Death is lack of correspondence with the environment."*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.10*

These two definitions match very well, each is the complement of the other. And both answer very well to the demands of the Spiritualistic sentimentalism that now passes for the Christian religion.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.11*

I had rather speak five words with my understanding, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.12*

"Bogus Piety" The Signs of the Times, 13, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

A recent dispatch giving an account of a series of post-office robberies in a town in this State, by a man named Weston, whose evil deeds had just come to light, closed with these words: "Weston was a church member, and very pious." Now this is not true, and is never true in any similar case. The man was indeed a church member, but he was not pious. He may have had the *appearance* of piety, he had not the real article. Pious do not do such things. Moreover, the man who wrote that dispatch knew that the post-office thief was not pious, and every worldlying knows that bank-defaulters, embezzlers, etc. are not pious men. They know that piety is not that kind of stuff, that Christianity calls for something better, and that Christians should act differently. And it is because they know this, that they never fail to mention that an erring man was a professed Christian. Such mention is always an unconscious and unintended tribute to the excellent character of true Christianity, because it shows that even the haters of Christianity know that evil and right are inconsistent with it.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.13*

But someone may ask how we explained the sudden falls from piety and integrity that we so often see or hear about. We answer that such sudden falls are not so common as is supposed. But when they do occur, we can explain them just as we would explain the sudden fall of a building. If a building falls suddenly and without warning, and apparently without sufficient cause, we say at once that there was a defect in its construction; it never was sound. It stood for a time, and was apparently sound, but continued pressure made itself fall in the place that was a weak. So a man who "suddenly falls" from piety, simply gives way under strong pressure upon some weak point. And as no building is any stronger than its weakest support, so no Christian character, however sound it may appear, is in any stronger than the spot that has never been built up. So in reality even this was not a sudden fall from true piety, but from the semblance thereof.*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.14*

In general, therefore, it may be set down as a fact that men do not fall suddenly into great sins. Solomon says that "the beginning of strife is as when one letteth out water;" the tiny stream soon makes for itself a larger opening, which gradually increases until a mighty torrent rushes through. So a little sin, covered up, a little defect cherished, brings condemnation to the individual at first, but the voice of conscience being repressed, he becomes hardened, possibly at last really unconscious of the fact that he is living a lie, and then detection

is the only thing necessary to make the world safe in derision, there is a specimen of a pious man, and others mourn over the "sudden fall" of one who was highly esteemed. They simply compound the detection with the fall, whereas the *fall* may have taken place years before. Then the cause of Christ has to suffer reproach, since people forget that it is really to the credit of Christianity that dishonest men put it on as a cloak for their ungodly deeds. They know that people do not look there for such things, and so they expect to escape without detection. *SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.15*

"Not 'Inferred' But Believed" The Signs of the Times, 13, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Standard*, in, an attempted, reasoning on the immortality of the soul, says:-*SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.16*

"When it is said that we do not read of the 'immortality of the soul,' in the Scriptures, the truth is spoken; but when it is inferred from this that there is nothing in man that remains in possession of conscious existence after death, the conclusion is not well drawn. The immortality of the angels is something not named in the Scriptures. Yet it would be most unsafe to infer that they are not to continue in this possession of conscious existence for ever. That which is mortal is subject to death, as the human body as it now is; that which is immortal is not subject to death, as the immortal bodies of the redeemed, as they shall be." *SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.17*

But the unconscious of men in the death is not "inferred" from the silence of Scripture on the subject of the "immortality of the soul." In fact it is not "inferred" from anything. It is the plain declaration of Scripture, and therefore, on the part of men who accept it, it is not an inference at all but is *belief* of the word of God. The Scriptures plainly state that "the dead know not if anything," also "their love and their hatred and their envy" is "perished" (*Ecclesiastes 9:5*); that when his breath goeth forth, "in that very day his thoughts perish" (*Psalms 146:4*); that "in death there is no remembrance of God" (*Psalms 115:17*); all these, and many more, Scriptures show that at death men go to the place of silence and forgetfulness, and to accept such a view as the truth, is not inference but perfectly-founded *faith*. *SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.18*

"The immortality of the angels is something not named in the Scriptures," says the *Standard*. Now the Scriptures say of those who shall be made immortal, that "Neither can they die any more, for [because] they are equal to the angels." To be equal unto the angels exempts from death for ever, and that is immortality. Therefore the immortality of the angels is named in the Scriptures. This is proved by the *Standard* itself. It says, "That which is immortal is *not subject to death*." And the Scriptures do certainly say that the angels cannot die, in that it is said that the redeemed cannot die anymore because they are equal to the angels. Therefore upon the *Standard's* following proposition the immortality of the angels is named in the Scriptures. Yet upon the supposition that the Scriptures do not name the immortality of the angels, the *Standard* says, "It would be most unsafe to infer that they are not to continue in the possession of conscious being forever." But if the word of God should say of the angels, as it says of men, that while they live "they know not that they shall die," but when dead they "know not anything," that their "thoughts" would then "perish," and they would remember not God, and "praise not the Lord," but would remain in silence and in the land of forgetfulness,-if the word of God should say all this of the angels, and much more to the same effect, it would *not* be unsafe to *believe* that they were not to continue in the possession of conscious being forever. And to believe so of men of whom all these things are said by the word of the Lord, is not only not unsafe, but is the *only real safe* thing to believe on that subject. This conclusion is well drawn. *SITI August 25, 1887, page 528.19*

September 1, 1887

“The Logic of Lynching” The Signs of the Times, 13, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

The latest argument for the existence of an eternally burning hell, is found in the *Interior* under the above heading. The writer recounts a recent lynching case in Colusa, California, where a young Chinaman who had basely murdered his employer's wife, was taken from jail and hanged, after his trial was over, and he had been sentenced to imprisonment for life. The writer argues that the reason why those citizens hanged the Chinaman, instead of leaving him to spend his life in prison, and to die a natural death, was because they believed in the eternal torment of the wicked, and from this assumption he concludes that the eternal torment must be a certainty. The reader will be interested to learn how easily a modern creature can find in his own imagination a solid foundation for a pagan superstition, so we quote:-*SITI September 1, 1887, page 534.1*

“That crowd of lynchers must have believed that if they hung Hong Di he would have to spend those fifty years in a worse place than the penitentiary. Hence they must believe in hell. If they had been materialists, thinking, with Colonel Ingersoll, that death ends all, or if they had been Universalists, thinking that everybody goes to Heaven as soon as he dies, or if they had been soul-sleepers, thinking that the spirit is unconscious between death and the resurrection, they would have said, Hanging is too good for this fellow. We have him now in our power as long as he lives. We can be sure that he will suffer for a good while at San Quentin. But if we put him to death we put him out of his misery forever, provided that Colonel Ingersoll is right, or we give him rest until the resurrection day, if the soul-sleepers are right, or we send him straight to Heaven if the Universalists are right.*SITI September 1, 1887, page 534.2*

“If Colonel Ingersoll had gone to Colusa a few months ago, and lectured at fifty cents a head, probably most of the men who engaged in the lynching of Hong Di would have gone to hear him, would have laughed at his witty sophisms, and would have half believed that there is no hereafter. If some eloquent Universalist had visited the place, and preached in the courthouse or in some public hall, denouncing “the partialists” who limit the mercy of God, and contending that he is too good to send anybody to hell or even to have such a dreadful place in his universe, they would have listened with interest and said, That's the doctrine for me. If the soul-sleepers had held a camp-meeting nearby, and talked, as they do, about the long unconsciousness-the dreamless rest of the tired and troubled spirit until the end of earth and time-they would have welcomed this idea of repose. But when a time of excitement came all such figments of fancy were swept away as chaff before the whirlwind, and the men in Colusa, no matter how godless in their lives or how skeptical in their speculative opinions, found they did believe in hell,-at least for Hong Di.*SITI September 1, 1887, page 534.3*

“Those lynchers showed that they had faith in God, for what was hanging but taking the murderer away from the control of the judicial system of California, which they regarded as having failed to do full justice in the case, and sending his spirit to God to deal with him as he deserved? If there was no great unseen power in the spirit world to take that guilty man, and to punish him more fully than the jury proposed to, then the lynching was unreasonable as well as unlawful.”*SITI September 1, 1887, page 534.4*

We feel like begging pardon of our readers for filling so much valuable space which belongs to them, with such childish reasoning. But we know that there is quite a general desire to hear “both sides,” and in this case the “other side” is presented by “Obadiah Oldschool,” the ablest writer of the *Interior*, whose good, practical, common sense is very conspicuous when writing on other subjects. Moreover, it is considered so good a presentation of the case, that the ideas have been copied and taken to form the basis of an article by the ablest writer of the *Occident*.*SITI September 1, 1887, page 534.5*

There is not the slightest possibility that one of the Colusa lynchers gave of a single thought to the future of the Chinaman. They simply knew that a great crime had been committed; they did not think the sentence of the court was severe enough; and so they determined to administer the proper punishment. It is not probable that one in ten of the men has any theory of future punishment; but if they had philosophized as *Interior* writer imagines, that would not in the least affect the facts. The idea that the lynching of a murderer is an evidence of faith in God, is a most novel one. If such transactions are accepted as *evidences* of faith, then, we can readily understand how the National Reformers can soon exhibit this country as a model of the Christian Government; for there are thousands who are willing to show their faith in this way.*SITI September 1, 1887, page 534.6*

But the simple fact is, those men believed, what all laws recognize, that death is a more severe punishment than any length of imprisonment can be. And how comes it that this opinion is so prevalent? Because the law of life is implanted in the breast of every individual. This statement, “All the man hath will he give for his life,” is none the less true because the devil used it; he was then talking with One to whom it was useless to lie. As long as there is life there is hope; but when life is gone, everything is gone. For this reason men universally

regard the death penalty as the greatest penalty that can be inflicted. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 534.7*

But more than this, is the inspired statement that “the wages of sin is death,” that “the soul of that sinneth, shall die,” and that the wicked “shall be punished with everlasting *destruction*.” Instead of reasoning as the writer in the *Interior* does, that men inflict the death penalty so that God the sooner can begin to torment men, how much more natural to reason that men regard death as the highest penalty, simply because God has decreed, and it is a fixed principle in nature, that death,-the total extinction of being,-is the sum of all calamities that can befall a man. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 534.8*

This would be in harmony with the Scriptures, which declare that the wicked “shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away” (*Psalms 37:20*); that they shall be “like the chaff which the wind driveth away” (*Psalms 1:4*); that the chaff shall be *burned up* with “unquenchable fire” (*Matthew 3:12*); that day shall be “as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away, as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind out of the floor, and as the smoke out of the chimney” (*Hosea 13:3*); and finally, that “they shall be as though they had not been.” *Obadiah 16*. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 534.9*

Life, under whatever conditions, is the gift of God. God is the *living* God, and the source of all life. “In his favor is life.” *Psalms 30:5*. That is, whoever has life, has it by the favor of God, and only those have life, who are objects of God's favor. We are now living in the day of salvation,-the time of God's grace to mankind. All people alike share of the favor of God, in that he gives them time to become reconciled to him. “The longsuffering of our God his salvation.” But when the wicked shall have filled up the measure of their iniquity; when even the longsuffering of God cannot wait any longer, because they have become “filled with all unrighteousness,” so that they are only as thorns that cumber the ground;-then further probation will be of no use to them, and the favor of God will be wholly withdrawn. But since only in the favor of God is there any life, it follows that when that favor is withdrawn, life must cease; and this agrees with the inspired declaration: “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth him.” *John 3:36*. When God shall judge the world in righteousness then, he will “make even a speedy riddance of all them that dwell in the land.” *Zephaniah 1:18*. He will have a clean universe, and not a corner of it will be defiled by being reserved as a prison pen where blaspheming wretches may be tormented to all eternity. W. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 534.10*

“The Sabbath—For What, and to Whom?” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

In *Exodus 31:13* we read: “Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you.” Again in *Ezekiel 20:19, 20* we read: “I am the Lord your God; walked in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and to them; and hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God.” *SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.1*

These two texts declare the Sabbath to be a *sign* by which the people might know that God is indeed the Lord. The question would naturally arise, How can the Sabbath serve as a sign by which people may know the true God? This question is answered in *Exodus 31:16, 17*: “Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days of the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed.” *SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.2*

Here it is plainly stated that the reason why the Sabbath is a sign, is that in six days the Lord made heaven and earth and rested on the seventh day. Now remembering that the Sabbath is declared to be a sign by which the people may know God, it is pertinent to inquire what there is in the fact stated in the latter part of *Exodus 31:17* which would constitute it such a sign. The answer is that the Sabbath brings directly to view and keeps before the mind, the fact that God created the heavens and the earth in six days and rested upon the seventh, which is the basis of the Sabbath commandment. See *Exodus 20:8-11*. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.3*

It must not be lost sight of, that God's distinguishing characteristic is that he is self-existent,-the living God,-and consequently a Creator. The fact that God can create distinguishes him from the “gods many and lords many” which people may worship. It is this, also, which constitutes his sole claim to the obedience of mankind, and, indeed, of all creatures. These points are plainly stated in the sacred word. Thus in *Jeremiah 10:10-12*, we read:-*SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.4*

“But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and everlasting; at his wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide his indignation. Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even day shall perish from the world, and from under these heavens. He

hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.5*

Here the true God is contrasted with the false gods, in that he created the heavens and earth, and continues forever. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.6*

Again in *Psalms 96:4, 5* the psalmist exhorts people to declare the glory of God, "For the Lord is great, and greatly to be praised; he is to be feared above all gods. For all the gods of the nations our idols; but the Lord made the heavens." In *Psalms 100:2, 3* we read: -*SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.7*

"Serve the Lord with gladness; come before his presence with singing. Know ye that the Lord he is God; it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.8*

Here the fact that God has created us, and that he preserves us, - in other words that "in him we live and move, and have our being," - is given as the reason why we should serve him. And a good and sufficient reason it is too. Indeed, it is the only reason that could be given, or that is necessary, for it is certain that if God had not created us, and did not sustain us, we should be under no obligation to serve him. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.9*

God's creative power, then, is his distinguishing characteristic, and the one by which he appeals to men to obey him. So long as men rightly consider the creation, so long they will remember God; for God is known by his works. "The heavens declare of the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork." So Paul says that all that may be known of God is manifested unto the heathen, "for God have showed it unto them;" because ever since the creation of the world the invisible attributes of God, namely, his eternal power and Godhead, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made. *Romans 1:19, 20*. But the Sabbath is the great memorial of God's power as manifested in creation. When kept aright it necessarily leads the mind back to creation; and the design of the Sabbath is that men may meditate upon God and his works. See *Psalms 92:1-6*, which is a psalm for the Sabbath day. Thus the Sabbath, being the great reminder of God's creative power, is emphatically a sign by which men may know the true God. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.10*

It will readily be seen, therefore, that the sincere observance of the Sabbath of the Lord, as set forth in the fourth commandment, is of the very essence of worship to God. One cannot fully keep the first commandment unless he keeps the Sabbath; for if he does not regard the memorial of creation, it must be that he does not properly appreciate the value of God's creation, nor his power as Creator; and to fail to recognize God to the full extent of one's intellect is to come short of the requirement (*Matthew 22:37, 38*); and when a man does not regard God with all his mind, he necessarily regards something else with at least a portion of it. Therefore to simply neglect to keep the Sabbath may be unconscious idolatry; but to willfully refuse to keep it is open idolatry. The individual may not bow down to images, but he worships himself more than he does God. There is plenty of idolatry without image-worship. While an image-worship is necessarily idolatry, idolatry is not necessarily image-worship. This is shown by the fact that there is one commandment forbidding idolatry, and another forbidding the making and worshipping of images. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.11*

In harmony with the thought in the above paragraph, is the fact that Sabbath-breaking and idolatry were inseparable among the ancient Israelites. They went and served Baal, yet it is stated that their captivity was a punishment for their persistent violation of the Sabbath. See *2 Chronicles 36:14-21; Jeremiah 17:27*. Now when it is remembered that Baal was the ancient sun god, the same to whom, under the name of Apollo, the Greeks and Romans dedicated Sunday, and that the first day of the week was "the wild solar holiday of all pagan times," the connection between the Sabbath-breaking and the idolatry of the ancient Israelites will be more apparent. When they joined themselves to the heathen nations around them, and forgot the Lord, they broke his Sabbath and began to celebrate "the venerable day of the sun." It would not be straining a point to say that the Israelites were punished for observing Sunday, in violation of the command of God. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.12*

But the objection is often urged that the texts which we have quoted refer only to the Israelites, and that therefore there is no evidence that the Sabbath was ever designed by the Lord to be observed by any other than the Israelites. Thus in the paper read before the late Baptist Conference in Oakland, after reference to *Exodus 31:12, 13*, and *Ezekiel 20:12, 20*, we find the following statements: -*SITI September 1, 1887, page 535.13*

"With these declarations before us we may observed: 1. That the duration of the seven-day Sabbath is at least impliedly limited to the generations of Israel. God says to that the ancient people: "It is a sign between me and you, *throughout your generations*." Why should this language be used if the Sabbath was of universal application, given at the creation of the world, and designed for all time? The inference is natural, reasonable, and almost unavoidable, that when Israel's generations ceased, the Sabbath would cease also. A limit is

placed upon the Sabbath and that limit is the limit of his people Israel." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 536.1*

This is a fair sample of the objection that is raised over these texts, and it *may be* that similar thoughts have sometimes crept into the minds of some who professed transference for the Sabbath of the Lord. For the benefit of such we wish to state a few points which will not only clear the matter of all difficulty, but show that the Sabbath this fixed to all eternity.-*SITI September 1, 1887, page 536.2*

1. We have already shown that the Sabbath is the thing which above all others helps us to recognize God and his power. It is the *sign* by which he may be known. Now while it is true that these words were addressed directly to the literal descendants of Jacob, there is no more reason for supposing that they apply to them alone than there is for supposing that the exhortation, "Do all things without murmurings and disputings; that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God" (*Philippians 2:14, 15*), applies to the Philippians alone. God is no respecter of persons, and what he requires of one he requires of all. He certainly desires to be known by all nationalities, as well as by the Jewish nation; therefore, although the language was addressed to one race, it is a fact that it should be heeded by all. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 536.3*

2. We cheerfully and hardly accept the statement that "the inference is natural, reasonable, and almost unavoidable that when Israel's generations ceased the Sabbath would cease also. A limit is placed upon the Sabbath, and that limit is the limit of his people Israel," we say that the inference is not "almost" but altogether unavoidable, that when Israel's generations cease, the Sabbath will cease, but not till then. Now when will Israel's generations cease? David was certainly an Israelite, and to him the Lord said: "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations." *Psalms 89:3, 4*. Again, "His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of having." *Verse 29*. And yet again: "Once have I swore by my holiness that I will not lie and to David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." *Verses 35-37*. Surely if the Sabbath is to be limited by the limit of the generations of Israel, it has yet a long time to continue. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 536.4*

Again the Lord says:-*SITI September 1, 1887, page 536.5*

"Thus saith the Lord, which give the sun for a light day, which divideth the sea when the waves of thereof roar: The Lord of hosts is his name; if those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me forever. Thus said the Lord: If Heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth search out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord." *Jeremiah 31:35-37. SITI September 1, 1887, page 536.6*

Here is stated in the most positive terms that the seed of Israel shall be a nation forever. Then the Sabbath, even according to the admission of the objector, must continue forever, and so it will. And let it be remembered that it is the seventh-day Sabbath, the only Sabbath in existence, which is to continue throughout all the generations of Israel. See *Exodus 31:13-17. SITI September 1, 1887, page 536.7*

These texts teach that the Sabbath of the Lord is to be kept by the saints throughout eternity. An abundance of texts might be cited to show that the generations of Israel will never cease, but the above are sufficient. Not only is it true that Israel shall never cease, but it is also true that it is the only people whose generations will never come to an end. To Israel alone are the promises (*Romans 9:4*) and only Israel will be saved. *Romans 11:26*. Two texts in conclusion must suffice, and they alone prove the proposition just made, that Israel alone shall continue throughout eternity, and that the Sabbath shall exist the same space. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 536.8*

Isaiah 45:16, 17. "They shall be ashamed, and also compounded, all of them; they shall go to confusion together that are makers of titles. But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation; ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 536.9*

Isaiah 66:22, 23. "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the lord, so shall you receive and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." W. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 536.10*

"Solemn Warnings" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.
(September 18.-*Matthew 7:13-25*.)

"Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and a broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." *Verses 13, 14.* The way to enter into life, according to our Saviour's own words on another occasion, is to "keep the commandments,"-in other words, to do right,-to "cease to do evil, and learn to do well." Now the reason why the road to destruction is so broad, is because a person may get there by doing anything not in harmony with the ten commandments. There are thousands of ways in which a person may do wrong; there is only one way of doing right. The way to life is both a strait and straight. Right means straight, direct; as Bunyan expresses it, is a way cast up as straight as a line can make it. The broad way as all the world beside this straight and narrow way, which is not of this world. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 538.1*

But before the way to life is entered upon, one must pass through the gate leading to it. What is this gate? Said Christ: "I am the door; by me if any man in enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture." *John 10:9.* The way to life is to keep the commandments; but before a start can be made in this way, the sinner must be delivered from the body of death, which can be done only by Jesus Christ. See *Romans 7:14-25.* All a man's efforts to walk in the narrow way without Christ are vain and useless. But the first thing that God does for the sinner when he accepts Christ, is to forgive his sins; therefore pardon for past sins, through our Lord Jesus Christ, is the way into the Christian life. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 538.2*

When we have entered the door, however, our connection with Christ does not cease, if we walk the narrow way. Says Christ again: "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." *John 14:6.* How can it be that the keeping of the commandment is the way to life, and that at the same time Christ is the way also? Simply thus: Christ himself is "the truth," and the law of God is declared to be the truth. *Psalms 119:142.* Christ is law personified, and he who lives in Christ, and abides in him, keeps the commandments. And he who does not abide in Christ does not keep the commandments, for Christ says: "Abide in me, and I in you. As a branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in a divine; no more can he, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." *John 15:4, 5.* *SITI September 1, 1887, page 538.3*

The same thought is expressed by Paul in *Romans 10:1-4*: "Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." The righteousness of God is the law of God; the Jews had not accepted Christ, and therefore they failed of attaining righteousness, for Christ is the only way by which the righteousness of the law may be obtained. That Christ is the end or object of the law, in the sense that in him we are enabled to keep the commandments, is evident from the next verse, which says: "For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which doeth those things shall live by them." So Christ is both the door and the way of life. Whosoever at the last day stands without fault before the throne of God, will be only "complete in him." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 538.4*

The way is described as a narrow way, and yet it is the only way in which there is any real liberty and freedom of action. Said David: "I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts." *Psalms 119:45.* Said Christ to the Jews who were walking in the broad way, and boasting of their freedom: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth [the law of God as revealed in Christ], and the truth shall make you free..... Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." *John 8:31-36.* There is no liberty except in the narrow way. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 538.5*

"Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit." *Matthew 7:15-17.* This warning is especially applicable at this time, for Christ said that one of the characteristics of the last days would be that "many false prophets shall rise, and shall deceive many." *Matthew 24:11.* Peter, also, whose second epistle treats especially of the last days, says: "But there were false prophets also among the people [in old time], even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of." *2 Peter 2:1, 2.* A prophet is a teacher; of that Peter's statement that there shall be false teachers in the last days, is the same as Christ's statement that there shall be false prophets. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 538.6*

These false teachers will have a wonderful power to counterfeit the truth. Said Christ again: "For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect." *Matthew 24:24.* This has undoubted reference to the phenomena

of Spiritualism, whose mediums are enabled, by their connection with the devil and his angels, to counterfeit the miracles of Christ and his apostles so successfully that no man by his unaided senses detect the difference. Some will thoughtlessly ask, "Why does the Lord allow his children to be thus deceived?" He does not. The people of God will not be deceived, and there will be no excuse for anybody's being deceived; for ample warning has been given. Says John: "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." *1 John 4:3*. This is of itself a sufficient warning against being deceived by the miracles of Spiritualism. All the miracles and the pretended good of Spiritualism are done for the express purpose of detracting from the glory of Christ as the son of God. If any are deceived by them, it is only because they "received not the love of the truth." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 538.7*

In the book of Deuteronomy there is a test by which we may be attacked the false prophet. Says Lord: "But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die. And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously; thou shalt not be afraid of him." *Deuteronomy 18:20-22*. That certainly is evidence enough, for the word of the Lord never fails. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 538.8*

But it will be urged that sometimes the signs and wonders *do* come to pass, and that in such a case nobody can be blamed for not distinguishing between the truth and the false. The Lord has anticipated this objection, for we read: "If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; or that dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. Ye shall walk after the Lord your God, and fear him, and keep his commandments, and obey his voice, and ye shall serve him, and cleave unto him." *Deuteronomy 13:1-4*. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 538.9*

In this we are directed to the word of the Lord as the greaat counterfeit detector. The whole thing is summed up by the prophet as follows: "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isaiah 8:19, 20*. And this test is not only good in the case of the teacher of Spiritualism, but in the detection of false teachers of the less pronounced type. Whenever a teacher utters a thing that deviates from the plain word of God, he is not to be received. It may be that his error is comparatively slight; but an error is an error, and he who accepts the slightest degree of error, has no warrant against accepting the diabolical teachings of Spiritualism, which is the sum of all errors. Our only safety is then sticking to the word of God. He in whose heart the law of God is, will not slide. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 538.10*

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." *Matthew 7:21-23*. Men may deceive their fellow-men with a great profession, they may deceive themselves; but they cannot deceive the Lord, who looks upon the heart. The Lord does not condemn the making of a profession of religion, nor prophesying in his name; what he condemns is the lawless lives of many who do these things. A man cannot serve God, with out having a form of godliness; but no perfection of form will save a man who does not do the will of God. The will of God is law of God (see *Psalms 40:8, 9; Romans 2:17, 18*), and when Christ says, "Depart from me, chief that working iniquity," he really says: "Depart from me, ye that work unlawful deeds." Here again we are brought to the fact that Christ is the truth, - the embodiment of the ten commandments, - and that no one can be really in Christ, - a Christian, - who does not keep the commandments. To profess Christianity while living in open violation of the law of God, is the sheerest hypocrisy. False prophets are declared to be a wolves in sheep's clothing; this hypocritical garb is necessary at first in order that men may be deceived; but sin has so terribly blinding an effect that after error has once been accepted and cherished, the wolves may throw off their mask, and appear in their true character, and still the poor, deluded victims will regard them as friends of the flock. *SITI September 1, 1887, page 539.1*

The sum of the whole matter is to build on a rock. The rock is the truth of God as it is in Christ Jesus, as far distinguished from the slime and mud of worldly things, in which all men grovel by nature. He who builds on anything outside of the word of God, is like the man who builds his house on the sand of the sea-shore at low tide, or who builds in the dry bed of a stream which in winter is a torrent. No matter how beautiful a structure he may build for himself, nor how smoothly the foundation may be laid, "There shall be an overflowing shower; and ye, O great hailstones, shall fall; and a stormy wind shall rend it. Lo, when the wall is fallen, shall it not be said unto you, Where is the daubing wherewith ye have daubed it? Therefore thus saith the Lord God; I will even rend it with a stormy wind in my fury; and there shall be an overflowing shower in mine anger, and great

hailstones in my fury to consume it. So will I break down the wall that ye have daubed with untempered mortar, and bring it down to the ground, so that the foundation thereof shall be discovered, and it shall fall, and ye shall be consumed in the midst thereof: and ye shall know that I am the Lord. Thus will I accomplish my wrath upon the wall, and upon them that have daubed it with untempered mortar, and will say unto you, The wall is no more, neither they that daubed it." *Ezekiel 13:11-15.SITI September 1, 1887, page 539.2*

Then "let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." *Ecclesiastes 12:13*. Thus shall we be "fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God," "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." *Ephesians 2:19, 20. W.SITI September 1, 1887, page 539.3*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

We have received the Annual Report for 1886-87 of the "Boys' and Girls' Aid Society" of San Francisco. The society is now in the fourteenth year of its existence, and of all the societies and institutions for the help of the homeless and unfortunate children and youth there is not one more deserving of the sympathy and charity of individuals and the generous support of the public. Mr. E. T. Dooley, superintendent, corner Baker and Grove Streets, San Francisco. Cal.*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.1*

In the *Gospel in All Lands*, the M. E. missionary magazine, for August, there is a letter from a missionary in India in which he speaks of "baptized children not counted as probationers." Neither are they members. But if they are neither members nor probationers, why then are they baptized? If it be said "for of such is the kingdom of Heaven," then how is it that they can belong to the kingdom of Heaven, and yet cannot belong to the church either as a member or as a probationer? Is the kingdom of Heaven made up of people who are neither members nor probationers of the church?*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.2*

Mr. Grant Allen says that "the most important result achieved by science in the past fifty years has been the establishment of principles antagonistic to the Biblical teaching of the origin and nature of man, and the history and order of the universe." But such science as that is not science at all. It is speculation only, and science falsely so called. Yet it is the popular thing, even in the leading pulpits of the world. In fact the "leading" pulpits would not be leading pulpits if they were not first *led* by this anti-Biblical science. "The leaders of this people cause them to err, and they that are led of them are destroyed."*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.3*

A San Diego (Cal.) correspondent of the *Golden Gate*, a Spiritualist, of course, closes an article with the following pertinent paragraph:-*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.4*

"No greater failure has been witnessed in the history of the world than Spiritualism as it has been presented. Not twelve men have been gathered together in one place capable of founding a new church, or any institution, college, or university where mediums may be properly taught. Think of it; after forty years, with thousands of wealthy Spiritualists-not a university in the whole world endowed by the people who rail against the churches. Is it not time to cry, *Halt!* and ask ourselves what all this cant and chaos mean?"*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.5*

Spiritualism, being a religion of selfishness, could not be expected to endow colleges and hospitals; but now that it sees the necessity of counterfeiting Christianity, instead of openly combating it, we may expect something of the kind before long.*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.6*

The Rome correspondent of the New York *Observer* says that "Pope Leo, the great conciliator, hopes for a reconciliation with Italy before December, 1887, when his jubilee will be celebrated, all Roman Catholic nations sending ambassadors to do him reverence." And then quotes from the sayings of the Pope himself a paragraph in which are these words:-*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.7*

"The only road to peace is to place the Roman Pontiff in a condition where he will be subject to no power whatever."*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.8*

Yes, that has ever been the ambition of the Papacy, and that is precisely the view which the Bible gives of "That man of sin... who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." No power on earth, or that ever was on earth, except the Papacy, meets the prediction. But the Papacy fulfills it to the letter.*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.9*

What would be thought of a soldier who should carry his weapons confidently and proudly when on dress parade, and throw them away as soon as he came into the presence of the enemy? Or, what would be thought of the soldier who carried the weapons of the ancient time, who would invariably throw his shield

away as soon as the darts of the enemy began to fly? Everybody would say that he was most foolish. The weapons are made for the attack, and the shield for the time of danger. And yet scores of Christians act just so foolishly. The Christian's shield is faith. With this we are told we may quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. With this we may ever see the loving, compassionate Father, and our faithful High Priest, and thus know that the Lord is on our side. But how many there are who have great confidence in God, and hold aloft the shield of faith when all is well, but to, when trials and affliction come, lose all heart, and think that even God has forsaken them? How foolish such a course seems, who has not done so? The faith which enables us to be at peace when the conflict is raging, is the only faith which will gain the victory. And this peace may be ours, for the promise is, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed on the." *Isaiah 20:3*. Therefore "trust ye in the Lord *forever*; for in the Lord JEHOVAH *is everlasting strength*." So the prophet says: "Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid." *Isaiah 12:2*. How true the words:-*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.10*

"Oh, peace we often forfeit.
Oh, what needless pain we bear,
All because we do not carry
Everything to God in prayer." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.11*

In the *Occident* of August is an editorial on "The Righteousness of God without the Law," that is, the righteousness which God imputes to all that believe,-*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.12*

"The righteousness of sinless creatures, though it be a perfect righteousness, well-pleasing to God, can only be available while it continues to be performed. The whole law is binding upon every creature during every instant of his existence. It is evident, therefore, that he can work up no superabounding righteousness to avail him in case of future transgression. The moment he transgresses, all the advantage derived from previous obedience ceases." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.13*

Boston has at last assuredly earned her right, if ever before, to be entitled the seat of culture and the chief city of refinement in the universe. The Boston correspondent of the *Christian Union* gives decisive proof of this, thus:-*SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.14*

"If hitherto any doubt has existed in any mind that Boston is fairly credited with the title, Hub of the Universe, the event in the Boston Theater last week should be final on that question. The renowned citizen and accomplished John L. Sullivan, the great expounder, whom the New York police interfered with while in the practice of his humane art of making jelly of other people's faces, was given a magnificent reception and presented with a "golden belt" which cost \$10,000. The large hall was crowded to its last limits with representatives from the principal cities of the United States and Canada. His honor Mayor O'Brien and the Aldermen were present by invitation. The location was called a sparring exhibition. The Mayor and Alderman were publicly thanked for granting license to give such an exhibition for the first time in history of the Puritan city. When Mr. Sullivan was presented the orchestra played 'Hail to the Chief,' and the immense audience rose and cheered him to the echo. Thus John L. Sullivan the prizefighter, goes to Europe, as he says, 'to bring back the greatest honors the world ever conferred on an athlete,' indorsed by the presence of the Boston city government. The belt he will wear abroad, and the honors of the occasion will say to all European municipalities that the municipal authorities of Boston recognize Mr. Sullivan as a worthy citizen, and virtually commend him to foreign countries as an honored American. They virtually send him over the waters as a boxing plenipotentiary, which is refined English for prize-fighter. He sails on this fighting exhibition (please remember the polite synonyms boxing, sparring) with their good-will and farewell blessing." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.15*

Of London's craze over the "Wild West" people the *Saturday Review* says: "This same worship is in close analogy to the later and more rotten days of the Roman Empire, when the gladiators were the favored ones and pets of the Roman ladies." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.16*

Yes, and so is Boston's craze for the modern gladiator, John L. Sullivan. Ancient Athens was the seat of culture and refinement, and yet her citizens loved to witness the brutal sports of the arena, and their highest conception of *virtue* was the strength and great courage of the champion of the prize ring. Thus it was with Rome. The modern Athens prides itself upon its culture, yet the man whose only claim to recognition is that he has more of the bull-dog in him than any other man in America, is thus officially recommended to the people of the Old World. And Boston is not alone in this sort of hero worship, only her "refinement" makes the comparison with ancient Greece and Rome more conspicuous. How long will it be before gladiatorial contests, possibly with some modifications, will be as popular among the "higher classes" in America as they were among the aristocrats of Rome? Not long, at the present rate of "progress." *SITI September 1, 1887, page 544.17*

September 8, 1887

"What Constitutes Burial?" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

The excuses which people can devise in order to bolster themselves up in a wrong practice, are legion. An excuse is not an argument, although it commonly passes for one. The *Congregationalist* of June 2 quotes the following from a tract published by W. Erbury; 234 years ago, saying, for by way of comment, that the writer "pushed immersionists hard for a conclusion more rational than agreeable." He said:-*SITI September 8, 1887, page 550.1*

"How are you 'buried with Christ by baptism' when Christ's burial was not his going into the earth and rising suddenly as you do out of the waters; but his burial must be *three days and three nights* which is a mystery you know not; *let the Anabaptists lye so long in the waters, then I'll say they are dipt under!*" *SITI September 8, 1887, page 550.2*

And this is thought to be a disagreeable pressure of immersionists. It must then be considered the strongest argument in behalf of sprinkling. Let us therefore analyze it. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 550.3*

1. Granting for the moment that his point against immersion is well taken, his argument would amount to this: "Immersion in water is not in the likeness of Christ's burial, because those immersed do not stay underwater as long as Christ was in the earth; therefore sprinkling *is* a likeness of Christ's burial!" This is the common way of self-justification. When one is accused of wrong-doing, he points to someone else, and says, "Well, he is doing wrong too;" and then he feels that he has fully cleared himself of the charge brought against him, and proof that he is in the right. Such methods are childish in the extreme. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 550.4*

2. Our author not only denies that immersion is baptism, but he denies that immersion is dipping. Says he: "Let the Anabaptists lye so long in the waters, then I'll say they are dipt indeed." As much as to say that a thing cannot be said to be dipped in water unless it remains there a few days! Our Pedobaptist friends will have to give us a new vocabulary, so that we may know what word to use in the place of "dip," when we wish to speak of anything placed in the water for only a moment. When Christ was importuned to tell who should betray him, he replied: "He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it." *John 13:26*. And the same person continues: "And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon." Would our ancient author, and the *Congregationalist*, which sustains him, claim that the sop remained in the dish three days and three nights before it was given to Judas? Certainly not, for they know that the whole supper lasted but a portion of one evening. But the sop was "dip," for the Scripture so declares. Then a thing may be said to be dipped, even though it remains immersed only a moment. It ought not to be necessary to go to Scripture to prove a thing which is proved by the language of common sense; but many people imagine that Bible language has a different meaning from that of common sense. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 550.5*

3. This also shows the absurdity of supposing that immersion cannot exhibit the likeness of Christ's burial unless the person immersed remains under water as long as Christ was in the earth. "Baptize" means to immerse, to plunge, to dip; and just as a finger is dipped, even though it remains in the liquid but a moment, so a person is baptized although he is in water but a moment. Christ would have been buried, even if he had been raised immediately after being placed in Joseph's tomb; so a man who is buried in the water for only a moment is as surely "buried with him by baptism," as though he remained under the water forever. And added to all this is the tacitly admitted fact that baptism must be a likeness of the burial of Christ, and that nothing but immersion does represent that event. W. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 550.6*

"The National Reform Association" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

"EDITORS SIGNS OF THE TIMES: In the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, as well as in ~~American~~ *American Sentinel*, I frequently see articles in opposition to the National Reform Association for some of its principles. Would it not be well to give your readers an opportunity to see the position of the Society and the principles it propagates? Then the readers can judge for themselves. The true character of the Association can be known by its own Constitution. Below I give you the preamble. It is as follows:-*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.1*

"Believing that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, and that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of the Nations and that the revealed Will of God is of Supreme authority in civil affairs; *SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.2*

"Remembering that this country was settled by Christian men with Christian ends in view, and that they gave

a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established;*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.3*

“Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our Public Schools, to overthrow our Sabbath laws, to corrupt the Family, to abolish the Oath. Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion;*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.4*

“Viewing with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, the legal sanction of the Liquor Traffic, and disregard of moral and religious character and those who are exalted to high places in the nation;*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.5*

“Believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidence of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government;*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.6*

“We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves,’ etc.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.7*

“The *Object* of the Association is given in the second article of the Constitution as follows:-*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.8*

“The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed Reforms in the action of the Government; touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and the other kindred peoples; and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation’s allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.’*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.9*

“Now, as a friend of truth and of our common country, I respectfully ask you to designate which of the foregoing paragraphs or sentences you believe to be false or erroneous. Then, if it be your pleasure, I will try to defend them; for I believe they contain only the truth. And I am persuaded that the welfare of the nation depends, under God, largely upon their acceptance and practice by the people.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.10*

“N. R. Johnston.”*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.11*

It is not at all strange that articles in opposition to the National Reform Association are frequently seen in the *American Sentinel*, since that paper is devoted solely to the opposition of the work of the National Reform Association. It is the only paper in existence that has for its sole object the defense of American institutions and for liberty of thought and conscience, and which opposes the work of the National Reform from a strictly Christian standpoint. As a consequence, its readers have had, and do continually have, abundance of opportunity to learn the position and principles of the National Reform Association. The *SIGNS OF THE TIMES*, however, has necessarily a wider range of subjects to deal with, and although it is opposed to the work of the National Reform Association, it has not, in the little that it has contained upon that subject, given its readers any extended idea of the character of that organization. We are therefore very well pleased to publish the above extract from the National Reform Constitution, and to comply with our friend’s request to designate which of the paragraphs or sentences we believe to be false or erroneous. We shall also be pleased to let our readers see what defense our correspondent can make for them. From personal acquaintance with him we are sure that his defense will be made in a candid and courteous manner; and his position as regular correspondent of the *Christian Statesman*, and member of the National Reform Association, may be taken as an assurance that he will represent that Association in the best possible manner. We shall now proceed to note the points which we believe to be false or erroneous, and to give the reasons for our belief.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.12*

1. The first statement, namely, “that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government,” may be true or false according as it is interpreted. It could be interpreted to mean that God has ordained that there be civil government among men, or that he himself exercises over ruling power, or as Daniel says “removeth kings and setteth up kings,” we accept it as true. But if it be interpreted to mean that all civil authority comes direct from God, and that he himself directs and controls civil government, then it is manifestly untrue. Every nation on the earth has a civil government, but there is no nation on earth of which God is direct ruler, nor has there been any nation whose civil powers was derived directly from God, since the children of Israel rejected God by choosing a king for themselves. It is a fact, as Paul says, “the powers that be are ordained of God,” but it should be remembered that this does not mean that they are necessarily

ordained as God's deputies in the moral government of the world, but that it means simply that government in general is in accordance with God's design. Proof of this is found in the fact that when Paul wrote these words, pagan Roman was mistress of the world, and the Emperor Nero, who represented that greatest of all earthly Governments, was the very embodiment of wickedness and cruelty. Yet even the Roman Empire governed by the infamous Nero was better than anarchy. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.13*

2. With the second statement, namely, that "the Lord Jesus Christ is the ruler of nations," we take direct issue. We have no hesitation whatever in pronouncing this to be false, because it is contrary to the Scriptures. Out of the abundance of scriptural proof on this point, we shall at present refer to only the following:—*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.14*

(a) Christ is now acting as priest and not as king. *Hebrews 8:1*. He is sitting at the right hand of God, but it is as "a priest upon his throne." *Zechariah 6:13*. His work now is that of an intercessor. *Hebrews 7:25; 9:24*. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.15*

(b) Christ himself likened his going to Heaven and returning again, to a nobleman that "went into a far country to receive for himself taking them and to return," and who after a time "returned having receive the kingdom." *Luke 19:11-15*. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.16*

(c) God the Father is represented by the prophet David as saying to Christ, "Sit at thou my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." *Psalms 110:1*. And Peter (*Acts 2:34-36*) makes application of this to the present time, when Christ is sitting at the right hand of God. If he were now the ruler of nations, he would not expect anybody else to make his foes his footstool. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.17*

(d) Christ does not receive his kingdom until just before he returns to this earth, and he receives it not from men but from the Father. See *Daniel 7:13, 14; 12:1*. The first of these passages, with the context, unmistakably refers to the last great Judgment, and it is at the close of this that Christ appears before the Father to receive "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." The latter text speaks of the standing up of Michael, who is Christ. Now the standing up of a king is an expression used in Scripture to indicate the taking of the reins of government. See *Daniel 11:2*. But the prophet says that when Michael shall stand up, that is, taking his kingdom, there shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time, and at that time everyone of God's people shall be delivered. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.18*

(e) The Father himself says to the Son, "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." *Psalms 2:8*. And the next verse states that when he thus becomes the ruler of nations he shall "break them with a rod of iron," and "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." This dashing and breaking of the nations will constitute the time of trouble such as never was. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.19*

(f) In harmony with these statements, we read that under the sounding of the seventh trumpet, during which time the nations are angry, the dead are judged, the reward is given to the saints, and the wrath of God is manifested in the destruction of them which corrupt the earth, great voices are heard in heaven saying, "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and ye shall reign forever and ever." *Revelation 11:15-18*. In *Revelation 19:11-21* we have a prophetic description of the smiting of the nations and the ruling of them with a rod of iron, with the statement that *then* he bears the title, "King of kings, and Lord of lords." And Christ himself (*Matthew 25:31-46*) states that when the final separation between the righteous and the wicked takes place, when the wicked are sent into everlasting punishment and the righteous are called to eternal life, it is when he shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, and that *then* "he will sit upon the throne of his glory." *SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.20*

All these texts, which constitute but a small part of the argument, show almost conclusively that Christ is not now ruler of nations; that he will not be the ruler of nations until he receives the kingdom from his Father just before his second coming in power and great glory; that when he receives it he will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips, and will call the righteous to inherit his kingdom with him. Therefore, for any individual to say that Christ is now ruler of nations, is to deny the plainest declarations of Scripture; and to make the claim, as many National Reformers have done and still do, that men can have any part in getting the kingdom to Christ, is nothing less than blasphemous presumption. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.21*

3. With the statement that "the revealed will of God is of supreme authority in civil affairs," we also take direct issue. That the union of Church and State is a pernicious thing, is so generally conceded that National Reformers themselves are careful always to deny that their movement tends toward any such result; nevertheless the statement which we have just quoted contain the whole substance of Church and State union. For, it must be admitted that the Bible is a religious book. It was given to men for the sole purpose of

teaching them the true religion. But the religion and the true church are inseparable. There may be a church and not religion, but there cannot be religion and not the church. In a word, the revealed will of God is the true religion, and is the standard of the true church. Therefore, if that will be recognized as of supreme authority in civil government, that government would be an ecclesiastical government; in other words, it would be a union of Church and State.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.22*

The revealed will of God cannot by any possibility be of supreme authority in human Governments, for that will require that men shall be perfect not only in our outward actions, but in thought. It requires that men shall not be angry, that they shall not indulge in the least degree of hatred or envy, that they shall not be covetous, and it declares that the harboring of such evil thoughts is just the same as the commission of outbreking sin. Now when it is stated that any document is of authority in civil affairs, it is implied that the power to enforce the provisions of that document, and to punish those who violate it, rests with the men at the head of civil affairs. But there is no man, or set of men, who has the power to determine whether or not a man is covetous, or whether he is cherishing hatred or other evil in his heart; therefore we say that it is utterly impossible that the revealed will of God should be the authority in civil affairs. Civil government is for the purpose of keeping men civil, and not of making them moral. When it attempts to interfere in the matter of morals, it assumes prerogatives that belong to God alone.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 551.23*

We might cite another instance which shows that to take the revealed will of God as the supreme authority in civil affairs, would be to unite Church and State. The Bible, which teaches the revealed will of God, says that it is the duty of men to believe on Christ and to be baptized. Now if National Reform ideas should be adopted, the Government would not only have a right, but it would be under obligation, to require every citizen and everyone who desired to be a citizen, to be baptized. In other words, baptism would be the evidence of naturalization, just as it is the evidence of church membership, and so the Church and the State would be identical. But it needs no argument to show that such a state of affairs would simply make hypocrites of ninety-nine-one-hundredths of the people.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 552.1*

Again, the apostle Paul says: "In everything give thanks; for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you." *1 Thessalonians 5:18*. It is manifestly the duty, as it is declared to be the will of God, for everybody to give thanks for the blessings which they daily receive. Now if the revealed will of God is to be of supreme authority in civil affairs, then civil rulers must enforce that will, and compel every man in the nation to give thanks. Of course they could not compel people to give thanks privately, but they could force them to church to offer thanks nominally, or by proxy, just as people now celebrate Thanksgiving Day. But such enforced thanksgiving would be a mockery, and it is not the will of God that people should thank him with their lips, while their hearts are far from him.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 552.2*

4. The second paragraph of the preamble contains a bit of sophistry and an assumption which is entirely at variance with the golden rule. It assumes that because the people who came over in the *May-flower*, for the National Reformers do not go back of that date, were professed Christians, and because the founders of the early colonies made church membership a test of citizenship, and subjected those who differed with them in belief to the same persecutions to which they had been subjected as dissenters from the ecclesiastical organizations of the Old World, therefore this Government ought to be professedly a Christian Government. But when they make this argument, which is a standard with them, we ask them, who was here first? Long before the arrival of the *May-flower* or the voyage of Columbus, this country was inhabited by powerful tribes of Indians, all of whom were pagans. Therefore if the National Reform argument were good for anything that would prove that the religion of this country should be paganism. But the argument does not amount to anything.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 552.3*

National Reformers seem to be blind to the fact that if there scheme should prevail, and they should carry it out as they propose, making a profession of Christianity the basis of citizenship, and declaring indifference to Christ to be treason to the State, they would run directly counter to many things which they now profess to desire. For instance, they profess to be staunch friends to the native Indians, and to the Chinese who are here. They declaim loudly against the injustice that is done to both of these races, and yet if their ideas were carried out, both the Indians and the Chinese would be out-laws and both would be subject to persecution, by the side of which all that they have had to suffer would be considered pleasure.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 552.4*

5. Our Government has no Christian features. The Constitution of the United States expressly forbids any religious test of any kind being required as a qualification for office or citizenship. The appointment of days of thanksgiving and the election of chaplains to pray in legislative bodies, are optional, and are practices that would be far more honored in the breach than in the observance, for they are only a mockery. Thus the National Reform preamble is self-contradictory in that it speaks of the Christian features of our institutions, and the Government's connection with the Christian religion, while at the same time it admits the fact that the Constitution which is the basis of the Government, is utterly silent concerning Christianity for any other religion.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 552.5*

6. We affirm most positively that the object of the National Reform Association, as set forth in its constitution, is not merely erroneous, but is unchristian and directly opposed to the spirit of the gospel. Its object is to amend the Constitution of the United States so that it will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ, and its acceptance of "the moral laws of the Christian religion," whatever they may be. This means, in plain language, that the Constitution is to be so amended that the officers of this Government may compel everyone who desires to be a citizen to profess Christianity, and to disfranchise all others. If it does not mean this, it does not mean anything. We have the statement of National Reformers themselves that this is just what it does mean. But the Christian religion knows nothing of any such coercive measures as this. The gospel call is, "Whosoever will, let him come." The ministers of Christ are simply ambassadors whose duty it is to entreat people to become reconciled to God, but who have no authority to compel any. Therefore we say that the day that sees the consummation of the National Reform designs, will mark the blotting out of Christianity in this country, except among the few who will dare to dissent from such an iniquitous form of government. That national Christianity, so-called, is the enthronement of antichrist, is proved by the Dark Ages, which followed immediately upon the professed conversion of Constantine, and the lifting of Christianity to the throne of the world. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 552.6*

We also view with grave apprehension the corruption of our politics, and the immorality not only of those who are exalted to high places in the nation, but of the nation itself; but we know that politics cannot be purified nor immorality checked by legal enactment. There is only one remedy for immortality and corruption, and that is the gospel of Jesus Christ. By this alone men be saved either from the guilt of sin or the love of it. We do not say that the preaching of the gospel will purify politics by making politicians and all others moral men, for the Bible nowhere holds forth the hope that all men will ever repent, and it is expressly declares that the righteous will ever be few in number as compared with the wicked, and that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse." See 2 *Timothy* 3:13; *Matthew* 7:13, 14; 24:37-39; *Luke* 17:26-30, etc. But we do say that whatever of purification is ever accomplished must be solely by the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 552.7*

We said in the beginning that we should be pleased to see what defense our correspondent can make for the aims of the National Reform Association, but we will slightly modify that statement. It does not give us pleasure to see men defending measures, the tendency of which is to lower the standard of Christianity, to give loose rein to bigotry, and to revive the persecutions of the Dark Ages. But if there is a modicum of good concealed somewhere in the National Reform Constitution, we shall be very glad to have it brought to light. *W.SITI September 8, 1887, page 552.8*

"Love the Fulfilling of the Law" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON. **(September 25.-Matthew 14:12-16; Romans 13:8-14.)**

These two portions of Scripture are given respectively as a missionary lesson and a temperance lesson; but it is only by great twisting that either passage can be made to teach anything specially about either missionary or temperance work. We shall therefore take up the second portion of Scripture, and briefly comment on that, taking it in its obvious meaning. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.1*

"Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." *Romans 13:8*. Instead of, "He that loveth *another* hath fulfilled the law," we should read, as in the Revised Version: "He that loveth his neighbor, hath fulfilled the law." This shows that Paul has reference to the second great commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." This appears more positively by the following verse which reads: "For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." The apostle does not mean that there are no other commandments than these, but that this comprehends all the law of which he is speaking. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.2*

This passage proves beyond all chance for question, that civil governments have nothing to do with enforcing the first four commandments, which define man's duty to God. For, the verses preceding treat of man's duty to civil government, showing that men should yield the obedience to the powers that be; and now when he says that when a man loves his neighbor as himself he has fulfilled the law, it is proof that he has fulfilled all law of which human governments are empowered to take cognizance. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.3*

The Bible idea of love differs materially from that held by the majority of people, even among those who profess religion. Love is not a mere emotion, which only the individual himself can feel; but it is an active principle which makes itself felt by others. A person cannot love without *doing*. God's love to the world was

manifested in giving his Son to die for the world. Our love to God is shown by our willing obedience to him; and our love to our fellow-men is shown only by the kindness which we show them. That which does not manifest itself in deeds of service for another, is not love. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.4*

There is so much selfishness in the world, and it is so natural to the human heart, that few have any proper conception of what love is. There is only one true standard of love, and that is the divine. That ye love one another, as I have loved you." *John 15:12*. And Paul says that "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." *Romans 5:8*. This utterly overturns the common idea that was embodied in the Pharisaic saying, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemies." The Bible rule is, "Love your enemies." Therefore we are justified in saying that the one who loves his neighbor simply because his neighbor loves him, does not love his neighbor at all. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.5*

"Love worketh no ill to his neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." *Romans 13:10*. This does not mean simply that we must refrain from doing actual injury to our neighbors, but that we must do them all the good we can. For if I have power to save my neighbor from any ill, and do not do it, it is the same as though I did him the injury. So Paul says in another place: "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." *Galatians 6:10*. To the same intent, Solomon says: "Withhold not good from them to whom it is due, when it is in the power of thine hand to do it." *Proverbs 3:27*. And all is summed up in the Golden Rule: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets." *Matthew 7:12*. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.6*

"And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light." *Romans 13:11, 12*. Much useless speculation is indulged in by commentators, concerning what is meant here by "the night" and "the day." The following from Dr. Clarke, is a fair sample: "If we understand this in reference to the heathen state of the Romans, it may be paraphrased thus: *the night is far spent*; heathenish darkness is nearly at an end; *the day is at hand*; the full manifestation of the Sun of righteousness, and the elimination of the whole Gentile world, approaches rapidly." To perceive the fallacy of this conjecture, it is only necessary to remember (1) that the Gentile world have never been illuminated by the Sun of righteousness, and (2) that there is no promise that they ever will be. Moreover, armor is always for defense, and "armor of light" must be for a defense against darkness; but there would be no propriety in an exhortation to put on the armor of light, if the whole world was about to be illuminated. With such a prospect, it would be more appropriate to cheer the people with the charge to prepare to lay off the armor of light, as something no longer necessary. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.7*

The simple truth is that this present evil world is a world of darkness. Says the prophet: "The darkness shall cover thee earth, and gross darkness the people." *Isaiah 60:2*. God alone is light. Before the fall, all was light. As men departed farther and farther from God, darkness covered the earth more and more. So we are now living in the night. In this night of darkness, the Bible is given as a light to our feet, and a lamp to our path. *Psalms 119:105*. It is a gleam from the world of light, which will make the path of them who walk in it, to shine more and more unto the perfect day. Those who are the children of this world, are the children of the night; but those who receive the light from God's word, are the children of the coming day. *1 Thessalonians 5:4-8*. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.8*

But although it is now night, the day which is to dawn for the righteous will be to the wicked a night so dark that all the darkness they have lived in will be thought light in comparison. So the prophet says: "The burden of Dumah. He calleth to me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will inquire, inquire ye: return, come." *Isaiah 21:11, 12*. When the day dawns and the daystar arises in the hearts of the righteous (*2 Peter 1:19*) it will be impossible then for the wicked to find any light from the word of God (see *Proverbs 1:24-32; Amos 8:11, 12*), but unto them will be reserved only "the blackness of darkness forever." *SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.9*

This time is near. No one knows how near, but it is certain that it is nearer than when we first believed. In view of this how necessary to heed the exhortation of the apostle: "Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof." *Romans 13:12-14*. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.10*

"California Camp-meeting" The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

The time and place of this meeting has been announced for some time, and we have no doubt but even now preparations are being made by many in different parts of the State to attend it. The committee have secured

good grounds, easy of access, and quite centrally located. The ground is between Twenty-fifth and Twenty-sixth and Market Streets and San Pablo Avenue. The Market Street horse-cars pass on one side of the ground, and the San Pablo Avenue cable cars on the other. For several years we have not had a camp-meeting so easy of access by people living in the city where it was held.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.11*

But it is not simply a large outside attendance that we want. We want to see a general turnout of our people from all parts of the State. This ought to be the largest camp-meeting ever held in California. And if it is to be so, it is high time for everybody to be preparing for it. Begin at once to shape your affairs so that you can leave, and when you come leave your homes cares behind you. Come also with the intention of remaining during the entire meeting. Moreover do not imagine that physical preparation is all that is needed; do not think that you will get all the spiritual good you need after you arrive at the meeting. If you would receive the proper benefit from the meeting, you must seek the Lord before coming. Bring his Spirit with you. Do this, not only for your own sake, but for the sake of others. Remember that you should not be content merely to receive blessings, but must be active to impart good to others.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.12*

Perhaps some are thinking that they will wait and attend General Conference. We earnestly protest against any such idea. General Conference cannot be to you what the camp-meeting should be. Most of the time of General Conference must necessarily be devoted to the transaction of business, and you would not be materially edified by simply listening to business, even of the utmost importance, for three full weeks. Moreover, to the brethren and sisters in the California Conference, the business of this Conference is of greater importance than is the business of the General Conference. You are *needed* at the business sessions at the camp-meeting, and must not fail to be present.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.13*

Again we say to everybody, Begin to make the proper preparations now; come early; and stay until the close.*SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.14*

"Religious Intolerance" The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago we gave an account of a Catholic procession in France at which a man was beaten nearly to death for not taking off his hat as the procession went by. It will be remembered that that was given by the *Christian at Work* as proof that France is not a godless nation. In the same paper, August 18, we have an account of another such procession, this time in Spain, as follows:-*SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.15*

"The Spanish Republic under Prim sought to establish religious toleration; and it was so successful that when the revolution came, and Alfonso ascended the throne, he had to accept the fact as a fundamental law. But the new law is not always respected, as the following shows. As the reader doubtless knows, in cases of administering the right of extreme of unction to the dying it is customary in Spain to go in a procession through the streets, the priest carrying aloft the 'custodia,' and an acolyte ringing a hand-bell, at the sound of which all passers-by are expected to kneel until the procession passes. Since the establishment of religious liberty in 1868 it is no longer obligatory on all to conform to this custom, and consequently many, from conscientious scruples, refrain from doing so, although, if possible, they endeavor to get out of the way, so as not to give needless offense. But the other day a woman-a member of the Protestant community-was passing through one of the streets of the town, and upon turning a corner came into contact with 'the procession of the host.' Not prepared to kneel, and unwilling to appear disrespectful, she stepped aside into a doorway to let the procession pass; but the priest rushed after her, dragged her out, and with great violence endeavored to force her upon on her knees. Not succeeding in this, he handed her over to two policemen, and charged her before the Judge of First Instance with insulting the 'established religion.' The judge took the priest's declaration [in writing], absolutely refusing to hear the poor woman, and ordered her off to prison to await her trial. Heaven knows when this 'trial' may come on, and so this poor woman and mother is excluded from her home for an indefinite period. It is gratifying to know, however, that the matter having come to the knowledge of influential parties in London, counsel has been secured and funds raised for the purpose of seeing that the poor woman receives justice."*SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.16*

France and Spain are two of the European countries in which the *Christian Statesman* and National Reform "cordially and gladly recognize the fact that the Roman Catholics are be recognized advocates of national Christianity and stand opposed to all the proposals of secularism," and which "in a world conference for the promotion of National Christianity could be represented only by Roman Catholics."*SITI September 8, 1887, page 555.17*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

In answer to inquiries, we would announce that the articles which appeared in the SIGNS last year, on "The Abiding Sabbath," will soon appear in pamphlet form. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 560.1*

If "A Reader," who under date of August 27 sent us two questions to be answered, will kindly send us his name, we shall be pleased to answer his questions the best we can. We do not wish to publish the name, but we cannot reply to anonymous communications. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 560.2*

The Rev. F. S. Hatch, of Hartford, Conn., telling in the *Congregationalist* of the success of the Connecticut law forbidding railway trains and traffic on Sunday, says that "Baptists, Episcopalians, Methodists, and Roman Catholics have united with Congregationalists in the successful attempt to secure this reform." He says the condition of affairs is not yet perfect, but that "it is a fresh illustration of the major truth that no evil in our midst can stand against the determination of the united Christian Church." And if the supposed evil happens to be a good, it is all the same. This is a pointer which shows how this church affair may easily be made national when the work of National Reform shall have progressed a little further. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 560.3*

There is in California a man by the name of Jesse Shephard, who is said to be a "musical phenomenon," producing the most wonderful music, both vocal and instrumental, professedly under the inspiration of spirits. His home is now in San Diego, where he is said to have given some marvelous exhibition in connection with masses at the Catholic Church. The *Golden Gate* relates that he was recently in San Francisco, and sang at the nine o'clock mass in the French Catholic Church on Bush Street, and adds:- *SITI September 8, 1887, page 560.4*

"The admission of so well-known a spirit medium to a participation in the musical services of a Catholic Church, would seem to indicate that there is less hostility towards the Spiritualism among the Catholics than there is among Protestants." *SITI September 8, 1887, page 560.5*

And why should there not be? The Protestant Churches received the doctrine of inherent immortality, which is the root of Spiritualism as a legacy from the Catholic Church. In a speech in San Francisco, two years ago, Monsignor Capel said that "to Catholics the spirit world was as clear as the light of a gas jet. They walked the streets accompanied by guardian angels. The dead were in their eyes disembodied spirits who surrounded the throne of God. They prayed to them as well as to the saints and angels. To say that they did not hold communication with the spirit world, would be contrary to the whole evidence of the history of the church." However, Protestants are not far behind Catholics in their acceptance of Spiritualism, as we have abundant evidence to prove. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 560.6*

An elder in the Disciple Church writes to the *Christian Church News* to know what should be done with members to keep their places of business open on Sunday. As that church professes to take the Bible as the sole guide, and is honest enough to acknowledge that there is no warrant in the Bible for calling Sunday a sacred day any more than other days, it is evident that nothing can be done in such a case. The church will have to wait until there is a law of the land enforcing Sunday observance, and then it will have a basis for the discipline of those who labor on that day. But before that time comes, many members of the churches will recognize the inconsistency of the church having to depend on human laws for the enforcement of its ordinances. *SITI September 8, 1887, page 560.7*

September 15, 1887

"Preachers" The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

Great harm comes to the church and public morality when preachers and other teachers hide themselves away from sight, become, in other words, recluses. But harm almost as great arises from their too prominent identification with affairs that do not properly belong to them. The latter difficulty is, perhaps, the present one, the many reforms and goodish movements of the period tempting them to help in their advancement. The middle ground is the right one, with a heavy leaning to the side of the gospel as a gospel of salvation. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 565.1*

"That They May All Be One" The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

There is no one thing to which Christians are exhorted more strenuously than they are to unity. Indeed it is the one thing essential. Without unity they have no means of proving to the world the truth of the religion which they profess. Christians are those who are united to Christ, and if they are united into Christ, members of one body, they must necessarily be united to one another. Therefore union is the great test of Christianity. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.1*

But when we say this, we do not mean that all who profess Christianity must necessarily be united. We can conceive of union that would be far worse than dissension. We refer to a union upon something contrary to the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus. Such a union would be no evidence of Christianity, as anybody can see. It must be, therefore, that when our Saviour prayed that all his professed disciples might be one, he designed that their union be a union upon the truth of God as revealed in his word. And this is still more evident from our Saviour's words in another part of that same prayer, where he said: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.2*

These thoughts were suggested by reading a letter which we recently received, and which the writer deplored the fact that some are keeping the seventh day of the week, the Sabbath of the Lord, while the majority of Christians observe the first day of the week. He wished that there might be unity in this respect, and hoped that the time would soon come when Christians should unite in bringing about the fulfillment of our Lord's prayer, "that they all may be one." Inasmuch as he pleaded quite strongly for Sunday observance, we conclude that he wants those who keep the seventh day to unite with the majority, and thus fulfill our Saviour's desire. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.3*

It is not an unfrequent thing for people to accuse the seventh-day keepers of bringing in dissension, and of being the cause of there being a division among professed Christians. Now to us the case looks very much as follows: a teacher sends her score of pupils out to play, with instructions for them to keep within a certain inclosure, and an express injunction for them to keep together and be united in their play. Very soon they propose a game if carried out would make it necessary for them to go outside the inclosure. They all start over the fence, except two who refuse to disobey their teacher. The others beg them to come along, stating that the teacher will not care, because so many of them have already gone outside, and then they remind the two of the teacher's injunction that they should keep it together. But still the two refuse to go outside, and so the play is hindered, and the good feeling with which they all started out is marred. The teacher, hearing the dispute, goes out to see what is the matter, and is told by the majority that all the trouble is caused by those two obstinate ones, who refuse to act in harmony with them. Now we think that almost anyone will say that the two are all right, and that the trouble is all caused by the majority who refuse to obey the simple command of the teacher. The teacher also would say that when she enjoined them to keep together, she meant that they should keep it together in the place marked out for them. No one would say that the eighteen ought to be praised for being united in an act of disobedience. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.4*

Well, God has enjoined upon all who profess to be learners from him, that they should be one; but when he tells them that, he expects that they will be one and obey his law. It would be too much to suppose that he would reward them for being united, if they were united in disobedience. Indeed, he has said that union in disobedience is displeasing to him, for we read: "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished; but the seed of the righteous shall be delivered." *Proverbs 11:21*. Numbers do not make a sin respectable in the eyes of God. He had more pleasure in Noah than in all the antediluvian world besides. In fact, Noah was the only one with whom he was pleased, and the reason is given thus: "For thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation." Doubtless Noah was accused of being a disturber of the people; but it was better to be a disturber on the side of right than to be joined to the multitude in error. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.5*

In later times, when the Jewish nation had nearly all gone into idolatry, there was one faithful man, who refused to join their iniquitous union. The Israelites were a very united people at that time, and did not want to have any disturbing element among them. And so when Elijah came to warn them again, Ahab said to him, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" Elijah did not accept the accusation, but stated the matter in its true light, saying, "I have not troubled Israel; but thou, and thy father's house [have trouble Israel], in that ye have forsaken the commandments of the Lord, and thou hast followed Baalim." *1 Kings 18:17, 18. SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.6*

We love union, but we hope that we may never accept of any union that will involve a violation of the plain precept of God. Rather would we stand in the law of the Lord, calling the multitude to return and walk in the old paths. *W. SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.7*

"Once a Sin Always a Sin" The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

A friend asks us concerning the curse in *Deuteronomy 27:23*, against a man marrying his mother-in-law, wishing to know if that prohibition is still in force, or if it is part of the law that was nailed to the cross of Christ. He says, "Does all from the *14th verse* to the end of the chapter stand good, except the *23rd verse*? Is so, why?" *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.8*

We say most emphatically, None of it has passed away. The words at the close of the chapter: "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them," apply to all the precepts therein recorded, without exception. There is no more reason for saying that *verse 23* does not apply now, than there is for saying that the *15th verse* is out of date. To say that these verses are part of that which Christ took out of the way, nailing them to his cross, is equivalent to saying that Christ is the minister of sin. For even heathen nations recognize the fact that to set light by one's father or his mother (see *verse 16*) is a sin. If this law is done away, then it would follow that it is all right for one to smite his neighbor, provided he does it in such a way as not to be found out. See *verse 24*. No; these curses are in full force to-day, and it is as surely a sin for one to marry his mother-in-law, as it is to make a graven image to worship, to smite a man secretly, or to take a reward to slay an innocent person. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.9*

The curses recorded in *Deuteronomy 27:15-26*, are all for violation of some one or other of the ten commandments. This can be seen by an examination of the passage itself and also by comparing *verses 11-14* with *Deuteronomy 11:26-29*. The latter passage reads thus: "Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you this day; and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day, to go after other gods, which ye have not known. And it shall come to pass, when the Lord thy God hath brought thee in unto the land whither thou goest to possess it, that thou shalt put the blessing upon mount Gerizim, and the curse upon mount Ebal." Now by reading *Deuteronomy 27:11-14*, we find that the curses which follow were to be pronounced in harmony with the above injunction, and with the statement that God set a curse before those who should transgress his commandments. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.10*

The simple fact is, and it should be remembered by all, that no man can be blessed now for doing what would once have brought him under the curse of God. God's will is ever the same. He never pronounced a curse upon any thing except sin, and no one was ever cursed except for sin. And since God cannot change, the standard of right and wrong must ever be the same. Whatever would bring a man under the curse of God four thousand years ago, will bring one under that same curse to-day. Wherever in the Bible you find a curse attached to the performance of a certain thing, be assured that that thing is to be always and forever avoid by the children of men. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.11*

"They Overpass the Deeds of the Wicked" The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

These words were used by the inspired prophet (*Jeremiah 5:28*) concerning the professed people of the Lord in ancient Jerusalem. The careful reader of the context, however, will readily see that their sole application is not to the ancient Jews, but that Jeremiah, while looking at the Jews, saw in prophetic vision far beyond them, and beheld another people in the last days walking in the same path. That the prophecy concerning Jerusalem has equal reference to the church in the last days, may be seen by reading from the beginning of the fourth chapter, and especially *verses 19-31* of that chapter. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.12*

If anything more were needed to prove that the iniquity which brought destruction upon ancient Jerusalem will be duplicated in the last days, we have only to quote the plain language of the apostle Paul, in *2 Timothy 3:1-*

"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, trucebreakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.14*

The last sentence shows that these things will be seen among those who profess to be followers of God. Within the past three weeks, three different things have come under our notice, which vividly illustrate some of the things mentioned by the apostle as characteristic of the last days. First of all, as illustrating the phrase, "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," we quote the following which appeared in the column of *Church News* in the *Oakland Tribune* of September 3:-*SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.15*

"A CHURCH ENTERTAINMENT

"Yesterday afternoon was devoted by the ladies of the Church of the Advent, East Oakland, to the selling of fancy work, toys, candy, and other useful ornamental articles at a bazaar open in Washington Hall. In the evening a short literary programme was given, after which dancing was indulged in until 11 o'clock. Refreshments were served during the afternoon and evening. About 11 o'clock the company was called together to attend an auction of cakes. W. S. Goodfellow acted as auctioneer, and succeeded in getting a goodly sum of money into the church treasury by the sale of the delectable merchandise." *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.16*

Lest some should by any possibility get a wrong impression, we will explain that the "Church of the Advent" is the name of an Episcopal house of worship, and has no reference whatever to Adventist. In regard to the above notice, some may say, "It shows, to be sure that they are lovers of pleasures, but how does it show that they are 'lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God'?" Just this way: Although professedly for the cause of Christ, the pleasures indulged in were such as are utterly incompatible with love to God. It was a pleasure which is only of the world. Now John says: "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." ¹ *John 2:15*. Therefore the indulgence in such amusements at all, at any time or for any purpose, is evidence of absence of love to God. But such things are common nowadays, and we pass to another phase. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.17*

Indeed *New York Observer* of September 1, we find the following item:-*SITI September 15, 1887, page 566.18*

"Strange things are done in the name of charity. The 'champion' prize-fighter of America, Boston delights to honor, recently gave an exhibition of his skill in the fistic art for the benefit of a Roman Catholic benevolent society in Rhode Island. Some charitably disposed persons in Paris, France, have improved upon the Sullivan scheme by instituting 'a grand cock-fight for the benefit of the poor.'" *SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.1*

Certainly nothing more than this is needed to prove the correctness of the appellation, "fierce," those who in the last days are content with only a form of godliness. To be sure the prize-fighter in Rhode Island was under the auspices of the Catholics, but they are now, by the most of the so-called Protestants, recognized as a "branch of the Christian Church." *SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.2*

But all these acts of wickedness and worldly pleasures are over past by a thing which was done in Illinois about a month ago. It was a "crazy supper" given by the ladies of the Methodist church. No description could do justice to it, and so we give below as nearly as possible a fac-simile, reduced in size of course, of the hand-bill which announced it:-*SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.3*

The Magic MCON is BREAKING,
Like a conqueror from THE east,
THE waiting we Rid awaking.
To A golden. Fairy feast-shakeSPEARE.
The LADIES of the M. E. Church,
assisted by their many friends,
will give a CRAZY SUPPER At the ARMORY,
SULLIVAN, ILLINOIS, WEDNESDAY EVE., AUG. 3, 1887
BEGINNING AT 5:30 O'CLOCK P. m. and
"We won't go home 'till morning."
Is it not Written, "Every vacuum must be filled?"
"Let no guilty man escape?" So come along.
Hear the words of the Prophet Jerry My Oh,

"The young MAN and HIS girl can't live on dry bread alone."
 So the crzy, maizy MENU will consist, among other things,
 Of Tongue, Chicken Salad, and just Everyday chicken,
 Ham, Pickles, Jelly, Cake, Ice Cream, Tea, Coffee, etc.,
 And will be served in many crazy, mazy, hazy waze.
 "And the light shone down on brave women and fair men."-Burns.
 Give ear, Oh ye inhabitants of Sullivan and vicinity,
 to the voice of DAVE, the SWEET RINGER,
 "make a joyful sound on the 'Psaltery and the Buttery,
 the TIN horn and the Cob Pipe,"
 such excellent music will be furnished.
 ADMISSION AND SUPPER, 25 CTS.
 Friends, Romans, Countrymen, WE come not here to talk,
 But to invite YOU to eat, drink and be merry.
 THE JOHN L. SULLIVAN NEWS PRINT. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.4*

One of the original bills, of which the above is an exact copy, is in our possession, having been sent us by our friend Elder A. O. Tait, who was holding meetings in the town of Sullivan when the crazy revel took place. The shape of the hand-bill we cannot reproduce, but it is sufficient to say that it is fantastic, and fully in keeping with the matter which it contains, giving evidence that those who got it up were eminently qualified to conduct a "crazy" supper. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.5*

But while the bill shows the church people who got it up to be "lovers of there own selves," and "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God," it proves to a demonstration that the epithet "blasphemers" is fully merited by these last-day professors. Passing by the extracts from the drunkard's song, "We won't go home 'till morning," which shows that their revel, beginning at 5:30 P.M., was to last all night, we call attention to the abominable caricature of the language of sacred Scriptures. Isaiah's prophecy of the forerunner of the Messiah, in which are found the words, "Every valley shall be exalted," (*Isaiah 40:3, 4*), is distorted into "Every vacuum shall be filled," and made to apply to the filling of the stomachs of unholy gormandizers. The name of that holy man who before his birth was designated as a prophet of God, is caricatured as "Jerry My Oh," and then to him are attributed the words, "The young man and his girl can't live on dry bread alone." And then, worst of all, if we can mark degrees in such blasphemy, is the parody of the name of the psalmist, and of the language of the Psalms, in the sentence: "Give ear, Oh ye inhabitants of Sullivan and vicinity, to the voice of Dave the Sweet Ringer, 'make a joyful sound on the 'Psalter-y and the Butter-y, the tin horn and the Cob Pipe.'" *SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.6*

We venture the assertion that there is not an infidel club in the United States that would dare put forth such a blasphemous caricature of sacred things. Truly the words of the prophet whom they have ridiculed apply to them: "For among my people are found wicked men; they lay wait, as he that setteth snares; they set a trap, they catch men. As a cage is full of birds, so are their houses full of deceit; therefore they are become great, and waxen rich. They are waxen fat, they shine; yea, they overpass the deeds of the wicked; they judge not the cause, the cause of the fatherless, yet they prosper; and the right of the needy do they not judge." *Jeremiah 5:26-28. SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.7*

It is not because we take pleasure in exposing the evil deeds of others, that we give such prominence to these matters, but that we may fulfill the injunction of *Isaiah 58:1*, and if possible to rouse those who are not wholly given over to such abominations, to the fact that the end cannot be far off. There is another point also, that we should make. When we say that the passage of a Sunday law would result in the persecution of those who conscientiously observe the seventh day, we are told that fact cannot be, because Christians will not persecute, and worldlings will have no interest in the matter. Leaving "worldlings" aside, what clemency, we ask, can humble commandment-keepers expect from "Christians," who have no sense of the sacredness of the Bible? What better are such professors than "worldlings"? And when the matter comes to the test, no more zealous advocates for a rigid Sunday law can be found than these same ones who walk in "lusts, ... revelings, banquetings, and abominable idolatries." Having no real godliness in themselves, they will think to make up for it by excessive zeal for a form thereof. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.8*

Further, Solomon says, "They that forsake the law praise the wicked" (*Proverbs 28:4*); and they who praise the wicked must, as a necessary consequence, despise the good; therefore it is as clear as the noonday sun that professors who are guilty of such blasphemy as these which we have noticed, or who suffer them without stern rebuke, well, when the power is placed in their hands, the foremost in persecuting those whose godly lives and teaching condemn their course. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.9*

When the Saviour was on earth he drove from the temple those who made it a place of merchandise. Soon he is coming again, and terrible will be the fate of those who do abominable deeds under the garb of religion. The prevalence of these things of which we have spoken should serve simply to cause the servants of God to

humble themselves, to seek righteousness, and meekness, that they might be hid in the day of the Lord's anger. "Hear the word of the Lord, ye that tremble at his word: Your brethren that he did you, that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the Lord be glorified; he shall appear to your joy, and they shall be ashamed." *Isaiah 66:5.SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.10*

Therefore, "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares." *Luke 21:34. W.SITI September 15, 1887, page 567.11*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

The SIGNS of September 1 contained the appointment for a camp-meeting to be held near Caldwell, Idaho Territory, beginning September 13. We have just received word that the date has been changed. The meeting will be held one week later September 20-25. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 576.1*

A writer in be *Evangelical Churchman*, of Canada, makes a strong plea for the Canadian Legislature at its next session to pass an Act authorizing the Governor-General "to issue a proclamation prohibiting all Sunday railway traffic throughout the entire dominion, at such a date as a similar Act shall come into operation in the United States." He says that "when the people of the United States know that Canada has passed an Act against Sunday railway traffic, which must remain inoperative until their own Congress passes a similar Act which in connection with the Canadian one would stop all Sabbath desecration by railway and steamboat companies, and when they are appealed to as they will be by pulpit and press, they will say, 'This thing must be done.'" This appeal by pulpit and press is even now being made, loud enough to be heard even to Canada. How long will it be before the thing shall be accomplished? *SITI September 15, 1887, page 576.2*

The question is frequently asked, "Why did God make a devil?" The answer is, He did not. He never made any being who was not perfect and pure. Satan was the chief of the angels who "kept not their first estate" (*Jude 6*), but who sinned and were delivered into chains of darkness to be reserved unto Judgment. *2 Peter 2:4*. Some unthinking person is likely to ask, "Why did God let him sin?" Simply because God made him an intelligent creature and not a machine. God does not delight in sin, and it is certain that he did not want Satan to sin, but when Satan determined to sin there was no way to prevent it without destroying his identity; for if by almighty power he had been restrained from open rebellion, the desire itself would have been sin all the same. The fact is, Satan sinned, and God's disapproval of the act has been shown ever since, and will yet be shown in the most marked manner possible, when Satan, with all his hosts, shall be destroyed. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 576.3*

In answer to the question, "Has it ever been a doctrine of the Presbyterian Church that unbaptized infants were lost?" a correspondent of the *Interior* says: "It has never been. On the contrary, Presbyterians have protested always against the doctrine." Well, then, we should like to know why they baptize infants. It is very certain that adults are baptized in order that they may be saved; for whatever carping there may be about baptism as a saving ordinance, we have the declaration, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned;" also the command, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." See also *1 Peter 3:21, 22*. The command is imperative for all who believe to be baptized; there is no exception made. To say that men who neglect baptism stand an equal chance of being saved with those who are baptized, would be to deny the necessity of that ordinance. And so when Pedobaptists admit, what they cannot deny, that infants who are not "baptized" will be saved as well as those who undergo the ceremony, they admit that the ceremony is entirely unnecessary, and if unnecessary, it is wrong. The so-called baptism of infants, which is in reality no baptism at all in any sense of the word, is a gross perversion of a sacred ordinance, and a mockery which has about it none of the elements of solemnity. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 576.4*

"What Shall be Done?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

P.A.F. asks: "What is a woman who is a Seventh-day Adventist, and whose husband is an infidel, to do if he requests her to buy or sell on the Sabbath day? Will not sin be imputed to her if she complies? Also her young children desire to keep the Sabbath, but the father will not let them do it. What shall she do? If she should resolve to live apart, she would lose the children entirely." *SITI September 15, 1887, page 576.5*

We do not know everything, and cannot undertake to tell people what their duty is in special cases, but so far as we have any light, the woman's course seems plain, although not necessarily easy. 1. She should keep the Sabbath. Her husband is not in the place of God to the woman; God's plain command far outweighs her

husband's request or even command. There is no human obligation which can set aside one obligation to God. 2. Sin would most certainly be imputed to the woman, as well as to anybody else, if she violated the Sabbath. 3. She should do with her children the best she can, by precept and example. If the father will not allow them to keep the seventh as they wish, she cannot help the matter. If she should leave, her influence over them would be at an end. Moreover, she has no scriptural warrant for leaving, and to do so would be unjustifiable, and would bring reproach on the cause. A woman may not leave her husband simply because he is not a Christian. Possibly she herself cannot keep the Sabbath as well as she would if she were alone, but by her quiet, godly life, she may save her children, and possibly her husband too. *SITI September 15, 1887, page 576.6*

One thing ought always to be remembered; very often fierce lions appear in the path just ahead of us, making it seem impossible to advance; when we push straight ahead, we find that they are changed. People are lost because of trials and dangers which they saw but were afraid to meet, rather than by those which they pass through. All of which is summed up in the words of the apostle Paul: "There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man; but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." *1 Corinthians 10:13. SITI September 15, 1887, page 576.7*

September 22, 1887

"Christ's Coming and Kingdom" The Signs of the Times, 13, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago we were requested to explain *Matthew 16:28*, but the question was mislaid. We will now consider it. For the first reads thus:*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.1*

"Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom."*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.2*

That our Saviour did not refer to his coming at the end of the world is evident from the fact that in his discourse on that the event in *Matthew 24*, he foretold a long period of persecution that was to intervene; and that he did not refer, as some have supposed, to the day of Pentecost or to the destruction of Jerusalem, nor to the spread of the gospel, is evident because (1) Christ did not come in any sense of the word either at Pentecost or at the destruction of Jerusalem; (2) the spread of the gospel is not the coming of Christ in any sense of the word; and (3) the gospel work had already begun by Christ, and had indeed been carried on from the days of Abel.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.3*

In *2 Peter 1:16-18* we are set upon the track of that which are our Saviour did really refer to in *Matthew 16:28*. That text reads as follows:-*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.4*

"For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount."*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.5*

The apostle here refers to the transfiguration scene which took place about a week after Christ's statement found in *Matthew 16:28*, and the account of which immediately follows those words. That accounts for reads as follows:-*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.6*

"And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them; and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here; if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." *Matthew 17:1-5*.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.7*

Remembering that Peter referred to this event as proving the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that it follows closely upon Christ's statement that some standing there should see him coming in his kingdom, and that just before he made that statement he was speaking of his second coming (*Matthew 16:27*), we must conclude that in the statement made in *verse 28*, Christ referred, not to his actual coming at the end of the world, but to a miniature representation of that coming.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.8*

Before proceeding to show how fully this was a representation of the second coming of Christ, we will quote some opinions of others. Dr. Geike, after commenting on *Matthew 16:24-26*, thus paraphrases, in his usual style, *verses 27, 28*, embodying the parallel passages in *Mark 9:38* and *Luke 9:26*:-*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.9*

"I shall one day return in a very different form, with the majesty of my Father in Heaven, and accompanied by legions of angels, to recompense everyone according to his works. In that day each true disciple will be rewarded according to his loving devotion and self sacrifice for my sake, and will be received by me, as the Messiah, into my kingdom. But I shall be ashamed of anyone, and call him unfit to enter that kingdom, who for love of life and ease, or for fear of man, or from shame of my present lowly estate, or of my cross, has wanted courage to confess me openly, and separate himself, in my name, from this sinful generation. It may be hard for you to think, as you see me standing here before you, that I shall one day, in heavenly majesty; but that you may know how surely it will be so, I shall grant to you now present, a glimpse of this majesty, not after my death, but while I am still with you, that you may see me, the Son of man, in the glory in which I will come when I return to enter on my kingdom."-*Life of Christ, chap 46, last paragraph*.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.10*

In his "Life of Our Lord" (p. 321), Samuel J. Andrews made the following clear statement of the case, which is

more satisfactory than Dr. Geike's testimony, because it contains the Scripture references which support the view:-*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.11*

"The promise that some then standing before him should not taste death till they had seen 'the Son of man coming in his kingdom' (*Matthew 16:28*), or had seen 'the kingdom of God, with power' (*Mark 9:1*), was fulfilled when, after six days, he took Peter, James, and John into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them. These apostles now saw him as he should appear when, having risen from the dead, and glorified, he should come again from Heaven, to take his great power and to reign. They saw in the ineffable glory of his person, and the brightness around them, a foreshadowing of the kingdom of God as it should come with power; and were for a moment 'eyewitnesses of his majesty.' *2 Peter 1:16*. Many errors still remain to be removed from their minds, especially respecting the time of its establishment (*Acts 1:6*), but the great fact of its supernatural character they could not mistake."*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.12*

Now let us briefly notice the details of this wonderful scene, to see how they agree with what we are told of the second coming of Christ in his kingdom.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.13*

1. "A cloud overshadowed them." So of Christ is said, "Behold, he cometh with clouds."*Revelation 1:7*. He departed in a cloud, and he is to return just as he went. See *Acts 1:9-11*.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.14*

2. "His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." Mark says that "his raiment became shining, exceeding white as snow; so as no fuller on earth can white them;" and Luke says that "his raiment was white and glistening." So of Christ's coming we are told that it shall be "in the glory of his Father." One, prophetically describing that coming, says: "His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had bright beams out of this side." *Habakkuk 3:3, 4*, margin. John, who afterward had a view of his coming, said: "His eyes far as a flaming fire."*Revelation 19:12*. And Paul speaks of "the brightness of his coming" as being so great as to destroy the wicked. Then but those who have been strengthened by the Lord can behold the glory of his coming and live.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.15*

3. When he comes the second time he comes to take his people to himself, and this he does by raising the righteous dead, and translating the living. Says Paul: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." *1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17*. Again he says: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." *1 Corinthians 15:51, 52*.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.16*

So, then, when Christ comes on his throne of glory, with a cloud of angels, to give reward to the righteous, there will be two great classes of them: those who shall be translated without seeing death, and those who shall be raised from the dead. These, when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, shall also appear with him in glory. *Colossians 3:4*. Now these two classes were with him on the mount of transfiguration. If they had not been, it would not have been a true representation of the "power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," as Peter says it was. All Bible readers are familiar with the fact that Elijah (the Hebrew form of the name of which in Greek is Elias) was translated without seeing death. See *2 Kings 2:1-11*. The record says that as he and Elisha walked on, and talked, "behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into Heaven." So Elijah was there with Christ in the mount as a representative of those who, when Christ comes, shall be caught up to meet the Lord without tasting death.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.17*

Concerning Moses, we have the record: "So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord. And he buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor; but no man knoweth of his sepulcher unto this day." *Deuteronomy 34:5, 6*. Turn now to *Jude 9*, where we read: "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." What could cause a dispute between Christ (who is Michael) and the devil, concerning the body of Moses? Only this one thing, that the devil has the power (*Hebrews 2:14*); he brought sin into the world, and death comes by sin; those who die he considers as his lawful prey, and he refuses to open the house of his prisoners (*Isaiah 14:16, 17*), which is the grave. He is the strong man keeping guard over his house; but Christ is the stronger than he, who has entered into his house, overpowering him (*Luke 11:21, 22*) and who now has the keys of death and the grave. *Revelation 3:18*. This power Christ gained by his death (*Hebrews 2:14*); but long before his death and resurrection he had this power by virtue of the promise and the oath of God, which were the surety that he would be offered. Knowing these facts, that Christ contended with the devil over the body of Moses, we are forced to the conclusion that their dispute was concerning the resurrection of Moses, Satan claiming that

Christ had no right to take him. But in every contest with Satan, Christ has come off victorious, and so Moses was raised from the dead, and appeared with Christ on the holy mount, as the representative of those who, at the second coming of Christ, shall be brought from their graves to ever be with the Lord.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.18*

If there should be a lingering doubt in the minds of any that Moses was really raised from the dead, and they should think that it was only his disembodied spirit that appeared on the mount, we will state (1) that the transfiguration is expressly declared by Peter to have been a representation of "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," and that at that time he and James, and John were "eyewitnesses of his majesty," which shows that it was a view of Christ in his kingly glory; (2) it is absolutely certain that when Christ comes there will be no such thing as disembodied spirits, because, says Paul, he "shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned unto his glorious body" (*Philippians 3:20*), and this change is performed for both the living and the dead. *1 Corinthians 15:51*. When the saints are caught up to meet the Lord in the air, it is with their own bodies glorified like the body of Christ. Therefore, (3) since, as shown above, the transfiguration was a representation, on a small scale, of this glorious event, it is certain that Moses must have been there in person, and not in shadow.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.19*

The transfiguration stands for us, as it did for the apostles, as a sure pledge of Christ's second coming in power and great glory; and yet "we have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." *2 Peter 1:19*. Let us study this sure word of prophecy, that we may walk in the light, and be prepared for the dawning of the "perfect day." *W. SITI September 22, 1887, page 582.20*

"A View of the Sabbath Day" The Signs of the Times, 13, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

In compliance with the expressed wish of a correspondent to "Please give your readers this view of the Sabbath day," we print the following communication. "This view of the Sabbath day" has been given and answered in the SIGNS a great many times, but line must be upon line, and precept upon precept. Besides the SIGNS is continually going to new readers, and we are always glad to let them know on just what foundation Sunday rests. The claims of the Sabbath of the Lord never were so strong as when contrasted with the claims that are put forth in behalf of Sunday. Here is the letter-*SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.1*

TO THE EDITORS OF THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES: An article recently came to my notice in your excellent paper, headed, "God's Law and Sabbath, or Man's Law and Sabbath." It seems to me that the writer takes an imperfect and one-sided view of the subject. Christians are to look at the spirit of the ancient law as interpreted by Christ. The schism among professed believers is a stumbling-block to the world. Previous to his crucifixion, Christ's prayer for his followers was, "That they all may be one." Paul says in *2 Corinthians 3:5, 6*, "Our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the *New Testament*; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." And *2 Corinthians 5:17*: "If any man be in Christ, let him be [margin] a new creature; *all things* are passed away; behold, *all things* are become a new." Again, in *Romans 7:6*: "But now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that [margin] wherein we were held; that we should serve in the newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." And further, we are to "delight, in the law of God after the inward man." *Romans 7:22*. Please see *Matthew 12:1-14*. "The Son of man is of Lord even of the Sabbath day." Verse 8. He came "not to abolish it, but to own it, to interpret it, to preside over it, and to ennoble it by merging it in the Lord's day." Further, the resurrection of our Lord was on the *first day of the week*. *Mark 16:1*; *Luke 24:1*; *John 20:1*. See *Acts 20:6, 7*, where Paul says, "And we sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. And upon the *first day of the week*, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight." We know that those nearest the time of Christ, except the Jews, beginning with Christ, kept the "*first day* of the week." Why should Christians keep the Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day? And as the majority of Christians all over the world observe the *first day* of the week, does it matter which day is kept; as much as that we *agree* to keep one day of rest, holy unto the Lord. E. C. R.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.2*

We do not recollect the article to which our correspondent refers, but no matter; we will consider his so-called proof for Sunday observance.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.3*

1. "Christians are to look at the spirit of the law, as interpreted by Christ." Exactly so. And his interpretation was that not one jot or one tittle of the law should pass away. Now if our friend would take the fourth commandment, and show that, although it declares the seventh day to be the Sabbath, it really means that the first day, there would be some point to his statement. But see further on this point in next paragraph.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.4*

2. Paul says in *2 Corinthians* 3:5, 6, "Our sufficiency is of God; who hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." This is commonly interpreted as teaching that the letter of the old covenant kills, but the spirit of the new covenant gives life, which is true enough as a statement, but is not what the text says. The text makes no mention of the old covenant, but only of the new. The letter of the new covenant or testament kills just as surely as did the letter of the old, and it is only the spirit that gives life. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.5*

Some, however, and among them our correspondent, seem to get the idea that there is some sin attaching to the observing of the letter of the law, and that it should be kept only in spirit, and not in letter, we would like for someone to have the kindness to tell us how such a thing can be done. It is utterly impossible for any man to keep the spirit of the law if he does not keep the letter. For instance, the sixth commandment says, "Thou shalt not kill." How could anybody keep the spirit of that commandment if he did not refrain from taking life? None but a Catholic will claim that the spirit of the second commandment can be kept by one who bows down to images. Certainly the spirit of the third commandment cannot be kept by one who uses God's name unnecessarily. So no man can keep the spirit of the fourth commandment when he labors upon the seventh day, upon which he is commanded to rest. It is sometimes urged that the spirit of that commandment simply requires rest, and that if a man rest on the first day he complies with this spirit as well as though he rested upon the seventh day. With as good reason might the heathen say that the spirit of the first commandment is simply that men should worship, and that he who worships Jupiter for Juggernaut complies with the spirit as fully as does the one who worships Jehovah. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.6*

3. "Again, *Romans* 7:6, 'But now we are delivered from the law, being dead to that wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter.' And further, we are to delight in the law of God after the inward man." Certainly nothing could be farther from proof for Sunday observance than this. The man who keeps only the letter, that is, the outward form of the law, is as though he did not keep it at all, because God requires truth in the inward parts. The law goes farther than mere outward acts, and requires that the thoughts of the heart shall be in harmony with its requirements. A man may keep the letter of the law, and still violate in spirit; but he cannot keep the spirit, and violate the letter. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.7*

This matter is fully illustrated by Christ in his denunciation of the Pharisees. They were very scrupulous in their outward compliance with the law, but maintained that it made no difference how a person felt or thought. Christ said that they made clean the outside, but within were full of extortion and excess. Said he unto them: *SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.8*

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." *Matthew* 23:27, 28. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.9*

Now hear what Jesus say to us all: "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." *Matthew* 5:20. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.10*

Notice, he says that our righteousness must *exceed* theirs. Now anything cannot *exceed* another unless it goes just as far as that other, and a good deal further. One man exceeds another in the amount of work done, because he does just as much as that other, and more too. So if our righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the Pharisees, we must have all the righteousness that they had, and a good deal more. What did they do? They kept the letter of the law perfectly. What must we do? We must keep the law outwardly and inwardly too. To talk about keeping the spirit of the law while violating its plain precept, is as absurd as to talk of traveling east or going west. So to say that the fourth commandment, which enjoins the observance of the seventh day, may be kept by the observance of the first day, is as absurd as to say that man in Chicago obeys an order to go to New York, by going to San Francisco. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.11*

4. "*2 Corinthians* 5:17: 'If any man be in Christ he is [or let him be] a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.'" How anybody's mind can be so twisted as to suppose that this text warrants the keeping of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, is beyond our comprehension. If any man is in Christ *he* is a new creature; it is the *man* that is new, not the law, the Sabbath or any other thing. Before a man is in Christ he does not keep the law. See *Romans* 7:14-25; 8:1. When he comes to Christ, he forsakes the old life and becomes a new man. As Paul describes it, he puts on "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." *Ephesians* 4:24. And this agrees with *2 Corinthians* 5:17, 18, where Paul, after saying that if they man is in Christ all things are new, he continues, "and all things are of God." Whereas in his previous life everything was of the world, now everything is of God. This is the exact meaning of the text. But to make it mean that when a man is in Christ everything in the universe that is old has passed away,

is equivalent to saying that not only the Sabbath, which is as old as creation, has passed away, but that the whole law, the whole creation, and even God himself, have all passed away, for all are of old.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 583.12*

5. "The Son of man is of Lord even of the Sabbath day.' He came 'not to abolish it, but to own it, to interpret it, to preside over it, and to ennoble it by merging it into the Lord's day.'" We know not from whom our correspondent quoted this precious bit of nonsense, but a more self-contradictory thing was never written. It is true that Christ did not come to abolish the Sabbath, but if he had "merged it into the Lord's day," he would most effectually have abolished it. Our correspondent says, "to interpret it." But it needed no interpretation. A child can understand the fourth commandment. It is a legal maxim that the words of the law are to be taken in their obvious signification, and there are none but common words in the fourth commandment. Again he says that Christ came "to ennoble it." But that were impossible, for it was from the beginning as noble as it is possible for anything to be. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." *Genesis 2:3*. Who can point to an institution more noble than that which was blessed and hallowed by the Lord himself?*SITI September 22, 1887, page 584.1*

It is said that Christ merged the Sabbath into the Lord's day. Impossible again, for the Sabbath was already the Lord's day. Christ himself said as much in the words, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath," for it was of the seventh-day Sabbath,-the only Sabbath in existence,-that he was speaking. The Lord said, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God (*Exodus 20:10*), and again *Isaiah 58:13* he calls it "my holy day;" and there is no other day that the Lord ever called his day. Therefore the seventh day is and always was the only Lord's day.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 584.2*

6. "The resurrection of our Lord was on the first day of the week." Granted; we wouldn't for a moment think of disputing it. We might state that his crucifixion was on Friday, and his ascension, was undoubtedly on Thursday. Our correspondent may ask, "Well, what of that?" We reply, Nothing in particular; but just as much importance attaches to these statements, as there does to the statement that Christ rose on Sunday. Why not keep Friday, because of Christ's crucifixion? or Thursday, because of his ascension? "Oh," the reply will be, "there is no authority for any such thing." Of course there is not; neither is there any authority for keeping Sunday, because Jesus rose on that day. The only authority is the Roman Catholic Church.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 584.3*

7. "We know that those nearest the time of Christ, except the Jews, beginning with Paul, kept the first day of the week." We beg our correspondent's pardon, but he doesn't know anything of the kind; and there is not a man on earth who knows anything of the kind; and there never was a man who knew any such thing. We have met assertion with the assertion; he offered no proof of his assertion, and so we have nothing to disprove. But if he will bring us from the Bible a single iota of *proof* that Christ, or Paul, or any other apostle, or any man named in the Bible as a companion or friend of Christ or the apostles, ever kept a single Sunday, we will print it in THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES in red ink, and in the largest type that we have in the office. Don't b backward with your proof, Brother "R."*SITI September 22, 1887, page 584.4*

8. "Why should Christians keep the Jewish Sabbath,-the seventh day?" We ask, Why should Christians worship the God of the Jews, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? Why should Christians follow the old Jewish custom of reverencing God's name? Why should Christians obey the old Jewish law that prohibited murder? You say that God was not the God of the Jews exclusively, but "of the Gentiles also." True; he is the God of all mankind, and consequently his holy Sabbath,-the seventh day,-is the Sabbath for all mankind; for "the Sabbath was made for man."*SITI September 22, 1887, page 584.5*

9. "And as the majority of Christians all over the world observe the first day of the week, does it matter which day is kept?" That's the way it always ends: It doesn't make any difference what the Lord says, because people have taken it into their heads to do differently. Just as if the action of ten thousands of people could change the mind of the Lord!*SITI September 22, 1887, page 584.6*

This article is already too long, but we wish to call the reader's attention to one thing: Our friend has not presumed to offer a single Scripture statement to the effect that Sunday is the Sabbath; he has given a few texts which have no more reference to Sunday than they have to the Declaration of Independence, and winds up by saying that it doesn't matter which day of the week we keep, anyway. And, mark this, he has done as much for Sunday as could be done by the most accomplished minister in the world.*SITI September 22, 1887, page 584.7*

In contrast with the Sunday argument, notice the simplicity of Bible truth:-*SITI September 22, 1887, page 584.8*

"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." *Exodus 20:10*. "And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." *Luke 16:17*. W.*SITI September 22,*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

From a single canvasser 594 subscriptions for the *American Sentinel*, accompanied with the money, were received one day last week. There are scores of people who want to "do something in the cause," who could do as well as this, and we do not know of anything which they could do which would more effectually help in the work. The field is wide, and but a very small portion of it has been worked. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.1*

Active preparations are already being made for the camp-meeting which is to be held in Oakland, October 6-17. Various committees of arrangements have been appointed, and it is the design to have the best arranged camp-meeting ever held in this State. We confidently expect, also, that the attendance will be the largest that has ever been seen at any camp-meeting in California. May the good that shall be done, be in proportion. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.2*

Hon. Washington Bartlett, Governor of California, died in Oakland, Monday evening, September 12. He was sixty-three years of age, and the immediate cause of his death was paralysis, brought on, it is said, by too close application to the details of the business of his office. This is the first time that a Governor of California has died in office. Lieutenant-Governor Waterman has taken the oath as Governor, and has entered upon his duties. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.3*

A London dispatch of September 16 speaks as follows concerning the European outlook: *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.4*

"One of the most discouraging signs of the European horizon, which promises no permanence of the present peaceful state of affairs, is the fact that all the great newspapers here and on the Continent are gathering together large staffs of war correspondents, and by buying serviceable horses, and in other ways, are preparing for the great struggle they seem confident is coming. In the meantime statesmen are puffing so ostentatiously the pipe of peace, that suspicion is excited that under the friendly cover of the smoke they are preparing for war." *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.5*

A week ago we listened to a sermon against the Sabbath, which differed, of course, in no respect from the average sermon against the Sabbath, having the usual number of contradictory statements. As a specimen, we note the following: The speaker claimed that the observance of the seventh day is anti-christian. Then he went on and applied Paul's words in *Romans 14* to the matter of Sabbath observance, claiming that the Sabbath question is not a matter for controversy, but that everybody should be fully persuaded in his own mind, and do as he pleases. The query arises, If the Bible tells people to choose for themselves which day they will keep, and says that it is a matter of no consequence which they observe, how can there be anything unchristian in the observance of the seventh day? Again, after stating that everybody should decide the matter for himself, and that no man should judge another, the speaker proceeded to plead for a law which should compel everybody to rest on Sunday! And yet we hear grave and learned men eulogize the sermon as a logical effort! *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.6*

There is nothing to which the human mind more readily turns than making excuses. Many find it difficult to believe that the professed church of Christ can ever fall to the depth of depravity portrayed in *2 Timothy 3:1-5*. But they forget the facility with which people can persuade themselves that *their* course is all right, and in perfect harmony with the Bible. When Saul had directly transgressed the divine command, he boldly met the prophet, and said, "Blessed be thou of the Lord; I have performed the commandment of the Lord." And we have known a man who by his own admission was an adulterer, to quote the seventh commandment, and claim that he had done no wrong. It is the easiest thing in the world for a person to deceive himself. Many persons of professed piety, who have been discovered in a crime, are entirely unconscious that they have been acting the part of a hypocrite. Their moral sensibility has become blunted, and their conscience seared, till they imagine that they really are as good as their profession would indicate. As a matter of fact, it will be found that when the church falls to the position indicated in *2 Timothy 3:1-5*, its profession will be higher than at any previous time in its history. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.7*

The latest argument against any law that shall in any way control the liquor traffic, appeared in the *Tribune* a few days ago. The writer says: *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.8*

"Besides lessening the number of drinking houses, the law lessens the number of opportunities for the development of self-sustaining moral capacity. What a truly ingenious device it is to institute conditions for the purpose of enabling men to confess in the bosom of their families that their presence at home results only

because there remains no place open wherein to make beasts of themselves!" *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.9*

All we have to say about this is, that it is a fact that there are hundreds of men who, whether they will confess it or not, cannot or will not refrain from making beasts of themselves, so long as there is any chance for them to do so; and we submit to all candid minds that it would be far better for a man to confess that he is sober from force of circumstances, than to have the circumstances altered so that he will be a brute. His family would say so, at any rate, and their comfort ought to count for something. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.10*

And then the writer has the unblushing impudence to say:-*SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.11*

"It is extremely unwise to attempt to subvert the natural and terrifying conditions under which life has been raised to its present height, and by which it is from day to day sustained." *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.12*

The next thing we shall hear will be that the liquor traffic is the only true religion. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.13*

As a fair specimen of the stories which are periodically gotten off at the expense of those who have not advanced so far as to be wise above that which is written, but who are simple enough to believe the truths of the Bible, we present the following, which we clip from the *Golden Gate*:-*SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.14*

"A preacher of the old school, a Scotch Presbyterian, who held to the literal meaning of the Scriptures, once announced as the subject of his next discourse, 'Interesting Events in the Life of Noah,' giving also the chapter he would read illustrative of his subject. A mischievous young man got hold of the kirk Bible and pasted two leaves together, so the minister read on the bottom of one page: 'When Noah was one hundred and twenty years old he took unto himself a wife, who was'-then turning the page-'140 cubits long, 40 cubits wide, built of gopher wood and covered with pitch inside and out.' He was naturally puzzled at this. He slowly read it again, verified it, and then said: 'My friends, this is the first time I ever met this in the Bible, but I accept it as evidence of the assertion that we are fearfully and wonderfully made!'" *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.15*

Doubtless many people have read this story and believed every word of it, have laughed over the simplicity of the honest Scotsman and thereby have imagined themselves wondrous wise. We might believe that such a thing happened, if it were not for two or three little *inconsistencies*: 1. There is no place in the Bible where mention is made of anything "140 cubits long, 40 cubits wide," etc. 2. The Bible nowhere states that Noah was one hundred and twenty years old when he took unto himself a wife. There is no statement made anywhere in the Bible as to what Noah did when he was one hundred and twenty old, nor is there any mention made of the one hundred and twentieth year of his age. 4. The Bible says nothing at all about Noah's taking a wife. Because of these things we are forced to discredit the story. These inaccuracies may be explained by a knowledge of the simple fact that people who know enough about the Bible to avoid them, do not give up stories in connection with it. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.16*

At a birthday reception recently given in San Francisco to W. J. Colville, a noted Spiritualist "inspirational" lecturer, the speaker who gave the address of welcome, said:-*SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.17*

"In olden times they stoned the prophets that were sent unto them, but we propose to help our young prophet with flowers and benedictions." *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.18*

If the speaker had read his Bible more carefully he would have learned that only the prophets of the Lord were stoned, -those who brought reproofs for sin, and threatening of coming judgments. But the false prophets, the prophets of Baal, those who assisted in the devil worship, and the professed prophets of the Lord, who spoke smooth things, and prophesied deceptions, and told the people that they were all right, were always received with flowers, and were lauded to the skies. Times have not changed at all. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.19*

The *Christian Advocate* tells of a preacher who "was translated." But by reading the notice through we find that he fell off a train of cars and was killed. And this is how he "was translated." Now this is not exactly the way in which Enoch and Elijah were translated. Neither Enoch nor Elijah ever saw death, whereas this man was killed outright. If therefore this man "was translated," then where has there ever been a person, from Abel to this day, who has passed from this life who was *not* translated. Neither the method or the idea of translation has very materially changed since Bible times. As to which it is that has undergone the change, the person who has respect to the Bible will have no difficulty in deciding. The truth is that it would be difficult to conceive how anything could be farther from the truth of the Bible than are the leading ideas of the theological world of to-day. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.20*

The question is asked, "Was it not cruel for God to send Jesus to die for us?" That question could not be asked by one who had any experimental knowledge of the Bible. "For God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." *John 3:16*. God did not "send" Jesus in the sense that he compelled him to die; Jesus was a willing offering. Paul says that he "gave himself for our sins" (*Galatians 1:4*), and Christ himself said "I lay down my life for the sheep." *John 10:15*. The Father and Son are one. The sacrifice was equal on the part of each. The Father loved the Son with a love as much greater than the love of an earthly parent for his son, as God is greater than any man. Yet his love for the creatures of his hand was so great that he allowed his Son to come to earth to die. There was only love in the whole transaction,-love so great that poor selfish mortals fail to comprehend even the faintest shadow of it. *SITI September 22, 1887, page 592.21*

September 29, 1887

"Is There Such a Thing as Death?" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

We find on our desk a letter from a professed "holiness" man, the editor of a "holiness paper", taking us to task in no measured terms for teaching that man is not alive when he is dead. The writer thinks that such teaching is "scientifically devilish," and says that if there is not a hell there ought to be one for people who will thus deceive the people, which charitable statement he makes for our special benefit. We pass this by as but the natural result of the Pharisaism which says, "Come not near to me; for I am better than thou," and notice the question at issue, for there is no doubt but that some people do honestly stumble over some of the points which our critic mentions. For the benefit of such we write. *SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.1*

We will repeat the statements which appeared in the SIGNS, with which fault is found; "Life and death are exactly opposite terms. Life means existence. So long is a man has breath, he has life, no matter what his circumstances may be," etc. This we reaffirm. For Scripture proof that "life" and "death" our terms exactly opposite in the meaning, we quote the following: "In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live." *Isaiah 38:1. SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.2*

Here we find life and death directly contrasted. If Hezekiah had died, he would have ceased to live. Again, read *Deuteronomy 30:19. SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.3*

"In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.4*

Also *Deuteronomy 30:15. SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.5*

"See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.6*

Here is life and blessing promised to the good, and death and cursing promised to the evil. Inasmuch as good and evil and blessing and cursing are directly opposite terms, it follows that death and life are also placed in contrast. The contrast is the same as in *Romans 8:13*: "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if the true the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.7*

Read also *Revelation 20:4, 5. SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.8*

"I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reign with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead live not again until the thousand years were finished." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.9*

Note that some who had been dead now "lived," and more than this, they "lived again," showing that there had been a cessation of life. There are two periods of living brought to view, separated by an interval of death, or of not living. Here again we seen death placed in contrast to life. Now know what it is that causes life or death. When God formed man of the dust of the ground, he "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." *Genesis 2:7*. It is the presence of breath that continues life. Job said: "All the while my breath is in me, and the Spirit of God is in my nostrils; my lips shall not speak wicked this, my time tongue utter deceit." *Job 27:3, 4*. That which is here called the "spirit of God" is, as the margin says, "the breath which God gave him." Job's assertion was that he would not utter deceit as long as the breath which God gave him remained with him; in the other words, as long as he lived. He knew that after the breath left him he could not utter either deceit or truth, the same Spirit that inspired Job, also moved another holy man to say: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man in whom there is no help. His breath go forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." *Psalms 146:3, 4*. Another writer also said: "The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything." *Ecclesiastes 9:5. SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.10*

So then that is the exact opposite of life, in that the living have breath and consciousness, while the dead have no breath, and do not know anything. But now the objection is urged that there are places in the Bible where the word "dead" or "death" is used without the meaning of non-existence or unconsciousness. As a sample objection, we quote the words of our "holiness" critic. He says: *SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.11*

"Will you please inform me if the apostle meant non-existence when he said, 'Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God'? Did the prophet mean that he was speaking to non-existence when he said, 'Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light'? And the word of God said to

Abimelech, 'Thou art but a dead man,' he meant to say that he was speaking to a *non-existence*? When the father said, 'This my son was dead' (*Luke 15:24*), he meant he was non-existent? he had been in a state where 'he had no breath'?-and the apostle meant they had no 'breath,' when he said, 'who were dead in trespasses and sin'? *Ephesians 2:1.**SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.12*

The trouble with our critic is that he does not seem to know that words may have a secondary meaning, or that there is such a thing as a figure of speech. We have known people to argue the same way about the word "day." They would deny that the days of creation were literal days of twenty-four hours, because the term "day" is applied to the whole time in which the gospel is preached,—"now is the day of salvation." That is, because the word "day" is sometimes used for a long period of time, they would deny that it is ever used with reference to a period of twenty-four hours; because a word is sometimes used in a secondary sense, they would deny that it could have any primary application! If our objector should ask us what a stone is, I might answer in the words of Webster's Dictionary: "A mass of connected, earthy, or mineral matter." And then he would reply, "Are you not ashamed to try to deceive people with such half truths? When Paul says that Jesus Christ is the chief corner-stone, does he mean that Jesus Christ is a mass of concreated, earthy, or mineral matter?" And then he might go on to argue that because Jesus is called a stone, it is utterly misleading to speak of a stone as being a mass of earthy matter. But would he claim that nothing can be called a stone unless it is like our Lord? Of course he would not. Everybody knows what a stone is, and its characteristics. And so when Christ is spoken of as being the chief corner-stone, they recognize at once that the idea meant to be conveyed is that he is something enduring, one upon whom it will do to build.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.13*

Now would the objector claim that when the Lord said to Abimelech, "Thou art but a dead man," he meant that he was in the same condition that Lazarus was in when the Saviour said of him, "Lazarus is dead?" Or that when Paul says, "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God," those to whom he is speaking are in the same condition as were the Assyrians after the angel of the Lord had smitten them, when it was said of them, "They were all dead corpses?" Of course he will not; for the most rabid Spiritualist, who denies that there is any such thing as death, will admit that the man who is in the condition commonly called death, is in a different condition from the one to whom that change has not come. Then it is admitted that there is such a thing as death, and that the dead are not alive.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.14*

Now let us consider each passage that is quoted above. "Ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." Note here that the word "death" indicates the absence of life. And so is the primary idea of death, absence of physical life, that the apostle uses in his figure. An entire article would be needed to properly explain the gospel truth here referred to; it would be sufficient here to say that the death is the same as in *Romans 6:2, 7, 4, 6*, namely, that the person is dead vicariously. He was a sinner under sentence of death, Christ has actually died, ceased to exist, for sin; and the sinner has accepted the death of Christ in his behalf, and has indicated such acceptance by baptism, and now the law considers him as though the penalty had been executed, justice is satisfied; the man has been put to death, in Christ, has "risen with Christ," and is now considered as another man.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.15*

Again, take the texts, "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give the light," and, "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." "The wages of sin is death." *Romans 6:23*. Those who are sinners are condemned already; they have sentence of death in themselves. Their death is sure, unless they repent, and so, by anticipation, they are called dead. The same explanation applies in the case of the word that came to Abimelech: "Thou art but a dead man." The thing which he had started to do, if persisted in, would surely result in his death, and so he was counted the same as dead already. But notice that these words mean nothing unless there is a fixed, definite meaning to the word "death."*SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.16*

In the parable of the prodigal son, the father is represented as saying, "This my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found." The son had been absent from home for a long time, and his father had had no word from him, nor any trace of him. He had been as completely separated from his father as though he had really been dead. And his father had mourned for him as dead. Therefore the father speaks of him as having been dead. So far as any communication between them was concerned, he was the same as dead. And this again makes prominent the condition of the dead—they are separated from their friends, and are silent; there can be no communication between them. This is the idea that is naturally conveyed by the word "death;" then so common is it that when the father in the parable would convey the idea of utter separation and the long silence that had existed between him and his son, he could best indicate it by saying that he had been dead.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.17*

It is only the fact that words have a fixed, definite meaning, that enables us to use them in figures of speech. If they had no fixed meaning, there would be no meaning conveyed by the figure. The reason why we have no difficulty in understanding the passages of Scripture that are quoted in this article, is because there is a fixed meaning to the word "death," to which the mind involuntarily recurs.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.18*

And so we adhere to our scriptural statement that death is the opposite of life; that life is existence, and that death is the absence of existence. He who does not accept this, is in duty bound to tell what death is, and to give the texts which we are to depend on as giving the primary idea of death. *W.SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.19*

"Baptism, According to Liddell and Scott" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

The Greek Lexicon of Liddell and Scott, has always been recognized as a standard lexicon of the Greek language. The work has passed through several editions, and the seventh edition has lately been issued by the Harpers, of New York. The work has been enlarged, and has been carefully revised, not only by the authors, but by some of the best Greek scholars of America. It may therefore be considered as representing the best scholarship of the world. It has occurred to us, therefore, that it would be of interest to our readers to know the definition that is given to the word *baptism*, the Greek form of our English word baptize. Messrs. Liddell and Scott are both professors in Oxford University, England, and therefore cannot be accused of being biased in favor of immersion. We give not only the word *baptize* but also kindred words. *SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.20*

Baptize, "a dyer or dipper." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.21*

Baptize, "to dip in or under water." The following instances of its use are given (we omit the Greek terms, and give only the translation): "of ships, to *sink* or *disable* them;" "*to the drowned*;" "*soaked* in wine;" "*over head* and *ears* in debt;" "*being drowned* with questions, or *getting into deep water*;" "*to draw wine, by dipping* the cup in the bowl;" etc. *SITI September 29, 1887, page 598.22*

Baptisis, "a dipping; baptism." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.1*

Baptisma, "*baptism*, the usual form in the New Testament." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.2*

Baptismos, "a dipping in water, ablution; baptism." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.3*

Baptistaron, "a bathing place, swimming bath; the baptistery in a church." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.4*

Baptistas, "one; a baptizer;" "*ho Baptists*, the Baptist." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.5*

Baptos, "dipped, dyed." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.6*

Bapto, "to dip in water, Latin *immergere*." The word is used by Homer, of a blacksmith who tempers steel by plunging it into water. *SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.7*

From this we can see that to talk about the "mode of baptism" is absurd, if reference is had to sprinkling or pouring. The term, "the mode of baptism," can only have reference to whether the individual shall be baptized forward or backward. It would be as proper to call sprinkling *diving* into the water, as it would be to call it baptism. We have seen little children run about in water two or three inches deep, and say that they were *swimming*; that was childish imagination, but it was no more absurd than for one man to sprinkle a few drops of water on another's head and then say that he has baptized him. *SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.8*

But strong as is the etymological argument for immersion, it is surpassed by the argument from the nature and object of baptism, as set forth in the Scriptures. When once the design of baptism is understood, the absurdity of calling sprinkling baptism is very apparent. In fact, sprinkling has no significance whatever, and there is not the slightest ground upon which it can be defended, except that it is the custom of the people. But "the customs of the people are vain." *W.SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.9*

"Another View of the Sabbath" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

Only last week we answered at some length a letter which was written for the purpose of showing that Sunday is the Sabbath. How far short the letter came from showing anything of the kind, our readers can judge. This week we have a somewhat similar task. From a Congregationalist pastor in Wisconsin we have received a very courteous letter stating the reasons why he cannot see that the seventh day is the Sabbath. The ground covered is entirely different from that covered by the letter and answer of last week, and so we present it at once. Certainly no apology is needed for giving line upon line, and repeated explanations, upon so important a subject as that of the Sabbath. Here is the letter:-*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.10*

"EDITOR SIGNS OF THE TIMES *Bear Brother*. Your paper was sent to me for several months, and among many articles on the Sabbath question I noticed one in the issue of January 20, entitled, 'Why Don't They See It?' Now I assure you that it is just as wonderful to me why you *do* 'see it' as you do. I should like to state a few points, as briefly as I can, in answer to that article and others like it:-*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.11*

1. The commandment does not say that we are to keep the seventh day *of the week*, but work six days and keep the seventh, *i.e.*, one-seventh of our time, as one-tenth of our income belongs exclusively to the Lord.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.12*
2. Because the Jews had a *certain day* as the Sabbath is no reason why we should keep that day any more than we are bound to keep it just as they did, or observe any other part of the ceremonial law.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.13*
3. The Lord blessed the Sabbath day *by making it a blessing to mankind to keep it*. Those who keep as the Sabbath the first day of the week are just as truly and greatly blessed as those to keep the seventh day of the week. Both keep the 'seventh day' and obey the fourth commandment.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.14*
4. Even if there was no other reason for retaining the day that we now observe, and there are most excellent ones, it can be shown from the Bible (our only guide) that Saturday is the day the Jews kept. It is not sufficiently true to warrant a division in the church of Christ.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.15*
5. A man is no better, morally, for keeping the seventh instead of the first day of the week. Obedience to any of God's commands, including the *fourth* in the decalogue, *does* make a man a purer, nobler, better man; but not so with this requirement of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES."*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.16*

We will take up these five points in the order in which they are given:-*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.17*

1. For the sake of bringing out a point, we will suppose for the moment that the commandment does not specify which day of the week should be observed. Our brother admits that the ten commandments are all binding, so that the fourth commandment is authority for observing Sunday. But if it does not designate the particular day to be observed, it follows that every man may decide that matter for himself. If it be true that the commandment requires the observance of only an indefinite seventh part of time, then there is certainly no authority for Sunday-keeping any more than there is for keeping Monday or Tuesday. We do not know just what position our brother would take, but we do know that all Sunday advocates whom we have heard or read on the subject, are quite agreed that it is necessary that all Christians should observe Sunday. Indeed, our brother himself deprecates a division in the church of Christ, on this point. But why should there not be a division? What is there to call for unity? If the only place where Sabbath-keeping is enjoined does not tell us *what day* to observe, what reason is there for being united? Why should not every day in the week be kept by different ones if they feel so inclined? Oh, it is urged, and very justly, too, if everybody should choose his own day, there would be confusion, and it would be utterly impossible for either public or private business to be carried on. Well, then, if it is necessary that there should be unity in the matter of Sabbath observance, and we fully agree that it is necessary, then it is necessary that someone having authority should decide which day of the week shall be observed. Now there is no man or body of men that has this authority. If God, in giving the commandment, has given every man the liberty to choose the particular day upon which he will rest, no man has any right to coerce another in the matter. It is self-evident that the only one who has any authority in the matter is the One who gave the commandment. If, as all agree, it is quite essential that there should be unity in the matter of Sabbath observance, then to say that God did not recognize this necessity, and provide for it, is to charge him with shortsightedness. The fact that unity is essential (and Christ himself declared that Christians should all be one), shows that God has provided for unity; and where can we find that provision if not in the commandment?*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.18*

Now we claim that the fourth commandment itself very definitely specifies which day of the week shall be observed: "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work." Where shall we begin this round of seven days, six days of labor and one of rest? Evidently at the beginning of the only division of time which consists of seven days, that is, of the week. Any child who knows that "seven days make one week" would, on reading the commandment without comment, say at once that Saturday is the day which it enjoins.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.19*

But we have an inspired comment on the commandment, which is sufficient to end all controversy. Luke, after giving the account of the crucifixion and burial of Christ, says: "And that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath true on." *Luke 23:54*. Then he says when the women saw the sepulcher, and how the body was laid, "they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment*. Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulcher," etc. *Luke 23:56; 24:1*. From *Mark 16:1* we learn that "the Sabbath was past when" the women came to the

sepulcher; and from *Matthew 28:1* we learn that this "first day of the week," upon which they came to the sepulcher, was immediately following that Sabbath day they kept "according to the commandment." But the day before the first day of the week is the seventh day of the week. Therefore it is as clear as words can make it, that to rest upon the Sabbath day "according to the commandment," we must rest upon the seventh day of the week.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.20*

Remember, the question is not as to whether we should keep the seventh day because those women or anybody else did, but simply as to what the commandment requires. Our brother has admitted that the fourth commandment is the sole authority for Sabbath-keeping, and we have shown from the Scriptures that the commandment declares the seventh day of the week to be the Sabbath, and requires all men to keep it. Who can fail to see it?*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.21*

We might stop right here, and consider that all the points have been noticed; for since the commandment clearly implies the observance of the seventh day of the week, all questions of custom, etc., amount to nothing. But we will briefly reply to be other points of the letter.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 599.22*

2. Of course the practice of the Jews is of no authority with us; neither is the practice of the Christian church. If we do not keep the seventh day because the Jews did, but because the Lord commands us to. This is an authority that may not be lightly disregarded. Perhaps our brother is unconscious of the fact, but in his implied statement that the requirement to keep the seventh day is only a ceremonial precept, he is discrediting all the other nine precepts of the decalogue. We should not like to have the opinion become prevalent that the sixth commandment was only a ceremonial precept for the Jews; for in that case this country would not be a safe place to live in.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 600.1*

3. We have already shown that the commandment requires the observance of just one particular day of the week. The statement that those who keep the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and those to keep the first day of the week, both keep "the seventh day," is a self-evident absurdity. The statement contradicts itself, and needs only to be repeated to be refuted. The Lord "blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it;" and so far as blessing to mankind is concerned, we have no warrant for expecting a blessing except in obedience to the commandment of the Lord. See *Deuteronomy 11:26-28*. A truly humble person will be blessed even though he is *ignorantly* violating some precept; but the blessing is not for his disobedience, even though it is unintentional, but for his obedience of every known duty. But no one can be blessed because of disobedience; he who has the light, and does not walk in it, may *claim* to be blessed; but he only is blessed whom the Lord approves.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 600.2*

4. Notice the fallacy of our brother's fourth point. He claims that it cannot be shown that Saturday is the seventh day, and then says that this is a reason why we should keep Sunday! Mark, he does not say that Saturday is not the seventh day, but only claims that it cannot be shown to be the day that the Jews kept. But that proves nothing for Sunday. Even if it could be positively shown that Saturday is not the seventh day, that would not prove Sunday to be the day to be observed; it would not prove a thing concerning Sunday. Truly the Sunday-sabbath rests on nothing at all, else its friends would give some *reason* for its observance.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 600.3*

Can our brother show that the Jews are keeping a different day now from the one they kept in the time of Christ, or for two thousand years before that time? Will he dare intimate that they have changed their day of rest? Of course he will not. The Jews who observe any day, still keep the same day, that has always been kept by the Jews. They now keep the day which we call Saturday, and that is the day that they always have kept. Then Saturday is the day that the women kept "according to the commandment," which Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John call the Sabbath, and which our Lord himself observed "as his custom was." There is nothing in this world more sure than that the seventh day of the week is the day which God commanded all men to keep holy, and it is equally certain that the day which is commonly called Saturday is that seventh day. To say that God has ever allowed it to become impossible for men to tell why they should obey one of his fixed precepts, is to charge God foolishly.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 600.4*

5. All we have to say to this is, that a man is *better* morally for obeying the moral law; and the fourth precept of the moral law declares that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and requires men to keep it holy. As well might Jonah have said that he would not be any better morally for going to Nineveh than to Joppa. What difference did it make where he went, so long as he went somewhere? Just this difference: the Lord told him just where to go, and when he did not go there he disobeyed the Lord. That was an immoral act, because it was an act of disobedience to the plain command of the Lord.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 600.5*

We trust that what has already been written shows clearly upon what basis the observance of the seventh day of the week rests. It is not a requirement of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. This paper has no requirements. But it does have an interest in trying to induce men to obey the requirements of the Lord. We heartily agree with our brother that "obedience to any one of God's commandments, including the fourth in the decalogue, *does*

make a man purer, nobler, better man;" and we are sure that that command cannot be obeyed except the individual does just what the requires. We know that obedience does not consist in doing one thing when the Lord has required another; observance of the first day of the week cannot by any possibility be construed as obedience to a commandment which requires the observance of the seventh day of the week. We submit this as a self-evident proposition. He who thinks that it can be so construed, must settle the matter with the Lord, and not with the SIGNS OF THE TIMES. It is He that has made the requirement, and not us. *WITI September 29, 1887, page 600.6*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

We have an interesting communication from Elder C. L. Boyd, Cape Town, S. Africa, which will appear next week. Lack of space prevents its publication this week. *SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.1*

The Youngstown (O.) *Daily Telegram* of September 9 contains an account of the Spiritualist Camp-meeting at Cassandaga, N.Y., which says: "The attendance has been so large on Sundays as to entirely overflow the amphitheater. If Spiritualism should be proven false, the fool killer would have to employ a large force of deputies, for it seems as though the majority of people nowadays believe in it." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.2*

It is stated on good authority that of the 2,500 suits begun in the Circuit Court of St. Louis, Mo., during the past twelve months, 700,—nearly one-third,—were divorce proceedings. The worst feature of the case is stated in the following words, by the same paper that furnishes the above information: "No longer can it be said that the ban of social ostracism is the award of the divorced man or woman, and the world appears to place them on a part with other people relatively situated financially and socially." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.3*

The *Presbyterian* says:—*SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.4*

"Men convince themselves that a thing is so because they would have it so. They sit in judgment upon the plans and purposes of God himself, and, by a 'helpful treatment of sacred Scriptures' supply what they conceive to be wanting in God's administration of the universe himself hath made." *SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.5*

This is a serious charge to bring against the "leaders of religious thought," but the most serious thing about it is that it is well deserved. The Bible is fast losing its hold upon the professed Christian church. When men take it upon themselves to "help" the sacred Scripture, they become judges of it; "but if thou judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law but a judge." To add a single thought or doctrine to the Scripture is virtually to deny the inspiration of the entire book. *SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.6*

The *Independent* makes the suggestion that every reader make it a standing rule to commit two verses of the Bible to memory, the first thing that he does in the morning of each day, and that during the day he repeat three verses to himself so frequently as to fix them strongly in his memory. We heartily second the suggestion. The task would not be a difficult one, and in the course of a year a good amount of precious matter would be stored in the mind. One who pursues such a course need never be lonely, for no matter where he is, he has something to think about; and we know of nothing else that will so effectually drive away evil thoughts. Try it. *SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.7*

We commend, also, the *Independent's* suggestion that the book of Romans be committed to memory in this manner. Seven months would suffice to accomplish the task, which would be performed so easily as to seem no task; and when learned in that way, the constant repetitions would insure that it would never be forgotten. *SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.8*

Some people decry the committing of scriptures to memory, urging that is better to have an understanding of the sense of a passage than to have the exact words in the mind. Just as if the committing of the exact words would make it impossible to understand the sense! As a matter of fact, we know that having the text in mind, where it can be meditated upon any time, is the very best way to have the full force of it impressed on the mind. And we are equally certain that some portions of the Scriptures and especially the greater part of Romans, and its companion book, the Epistle to the Galatians, cannot be appreciated until they are in just that way. No mere reading will ever unfold their treasures to any mind. *SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.9*

"When a wicked men dieth his expectation shall perish; and the hope of unjust men perisheth." *Proverbs 11:7*. Thus saith the Scripture, and yet grave and learned Doctors of Divinity will persist in telling the people, from the pulpit and through the religious press, that the Scriptures give no intimation that any man's probation closes at death, and because the doctrine is a pleasing one, and because the assertion is made by men who

claim that they know all about the Bible, thousands of people are accepting it without taking the trouble to read for themselves what the Bible says. A terrible awaking awaits those who, having intelligence, and the light of truth within their reach, are content to let somebody else to do their thinking for them.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.10*

A friend has sent us a copy of the *Pacific Methodist* which contains a communication "on the Sabbath question," and suggests that we may want to answer it. An answer is not necessary, for it kills itself. As evidence of this we quote one item. The gentleman, who prefixes "Rev." to his name, denies that the word "day," in any place in *Genesis 1* or *2*, means a period of twenty-four hours, and offers "in proof" the following profound argument:-*SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.11*

"The six days of *Genesis 1*, are each closed by the words evening and morning. According to Dr. Young's Analytical Concordance, the same Hebrew words, translated the evening and the morning, are used to mark the periods of time both before and after the creation of the sun and moon. With Dr. Young agreed many other competent authorities on this point. The evening and the morning were certainly not measured by the revolution of the earth around the sun before the creation of the sun!"*SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.12*

Astonishing! But we would like to ask if the day has been measured by the revolution of the earth around the sun at any time since the sun was created. If we are correctly informed, the day is measured by the revolution of the earth on its own axis, without reference to the sun, and that could be done before the sun was made as well as afterwards. The sun was made to rule the day that already existed; but the earth would revolve on its axis once in twenty-four hours, forming the day, if the sun did not shine at all. Who has the next astrogeological "reason" to bring against the commandment of the Lord?*SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.13*

Quite recently Dr. Lyman Abbott published a "Confession of Faith" in the *Christian Union*, in which he took the position that there is no close of probation at death any more than at any other time. A Congregationalist pastor in Massachusetts wrote to Dr. Abbott, thanking him for expressing so perfectly his own eschatological views, and added: "I wish such a Confession of Faith could be infinitely manifolded and distributed among those who are cobwebbed with the faith which dwelt in 'grandmother Lois.'" This faith which dwelt in grandmother Lois, is the faith which was in the Timothy, and which caused the apostle Paul to be filled with joy. See *2 Timothy 1:4, 5*. But the "new theology" which counts Doctor Abbott as one of its ablest champions, proposes to emancipate people from all such faith! Could there be a more open confession that the theology which is becoming so popular is contrary to the Bible? To some this may not seem a very serious matter, because, as they say, the issue is simply one of doctrine, and is not practical. But we know that the real question is whether or not the Bible shall be accepted by a professed Christians as of final authority in matters of faith. It is fact being decided that it shall not be. But the Bible is the only thing which gives light in matters of morality, and when it is cast aside, and human reason substituted, what is going to hinder the people from plunging into all manner of immorality? Isn't it time poor somebody to "cry aloud"?*SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.14*

The annual killing of hunters in California and Oregon has begun and is going on at the usual lively rate. Almost every other day the dispatches announce the killing of a man for a bear or a deer, or else of a man killing himself by crawling through the brush, or through a fence, or getting out of a boat or wagon, and pulling his gun after him. of course it is all "accidental," but for none of it is there a particle of excuse. As for the killing of a man for a bear or a deer, or for any other piece of game, it ought to be made a crime with a heavy penalty attached. If such hunters were made to realize that the penitentiary stood before them, they would be more careful to see, before shooting, whether the object of their aim was a man, or some other game. It is true that if this were so, there might occasionally a deer escape. But it seems to us that it would be better to kill fewer deer than more men. This may be old foggyish but so the thing appears to us.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.15*

As for those who kill or maim themselves by dragging their guns after them, as they themselves pay the penalty of their own senseless carelessness, of course no laws are needed on that point. But to people who want to go a-gunning without killing themselves, it may be in order to suggest that it is just as easy to put your gun ahead of you and crawl up to it, as it is to put yourself ahead and drag your gun after you. It is just as easy, and a good deal safer. Yet it is altogether likely that for the present generation of gunners, this suggestion is gratuitous; because those who have sense enough to handle a gun will keep it before them, and those who have not sense enough will hardly profit by any suggestion that might be made.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.16*

The following item, from the dispatches of September 17, should be published everywhere. If the crime-condoning juries everywhere were treated as were these who so richly deserved it, there would soon be a much more wholesome atmosphere about the criminal jurisprudence of the country. The case occurred in Kansas City.*SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.17*

"Judge White's charge to the jury in the case of John Snyder, charged with attempting to assault Ruth Rollard, aged seven years, was strongly in favor of conviction. After being out about five minutes, the jury return a verdict of guilty and fixed the punishment at six months in the county jail. The clerk had scarcely finished reading the verdict when Judge White, frowning angrily, thumped violently on the desk and exclaimed: 'Mr. Clerk, read that verdict again.' The verdict being read, the Judge inquired: 'So say you all, gentleman of the jury?'" *SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.18*

"The answer was in the affirmative and the judge said: 'Gentlemen, I shall take the liberty to set your verdict aside. If you had found the defendant not guilty I should have nothing to say, but when you find him guilty and assess his punishment at six months, you perpetrate an outrage. If you think men may take female children from the cradle for the purpose of gratifying their lustful desires, and then escape on an imprisonment of six months, you are a disgrace to the civilization of the day. You will all now be discharged from attendance and forever disqualified as jurors in this court.'" *SITI September 29, 1887, page 608.19*

October 6, 1887

"Why Will They Say So?" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

The New York correspondent of the *Michigan Christian Advocate* recently gave an account of the funeral of Bishop Harris, in the course of which he said:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.1*

"He is not dead. God's saints don't die; they only change their modes and forms of life."*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.2*

As soon as we read that, certain texts of Scripture came to our mind, and we jot them down for the benefit of those who may have given a hasty assent to the *Advocate* correspondent's assertion.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.3*

"And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty years of; and *he died*." *Genesis 9:29.SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.4*

Noah was certainly a saint, for we read that he was "a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God" (*Genesis 6:9*); and that by his favor and obedience "condemned the world." *Hebrews 11:7*. Yet the inspired declaration is that "he died."*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.5*

Of Abraham we read:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.6*

"Then Abraham gave up the ghost, and died in a good old age, an old man, and full of years." *Genesis 25:8.SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.7*

Of Moses, who was honored of God more than any other man that ever lived, and he was faithful in all the Lord gave him to do (see *Numbers 12:6-8*), the record says:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.8*

"So Moses the servant of the Lord died there in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord." *Deuteronomy 34:5.SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.9*

Again we read of another great and good man:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.10*

"And it came to pass after these things, that Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of the Lord, died, been an hundred and ten years old." *Joshua 24:29.SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.11*

Samuel was one the whowas consecrated to the service of the Lord at a very early age. While yet a small child he was employed by the Lord to perform a very delicate task, and his whole life was marked by piety and strict devotion to duty. Of him the record is:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.12*

"And Samuel died; and all the Israelites were gathered together, and lamented him, and buried him in his house at Ramah." *1 Samuel 25:1*. And again: "Now Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city." *1 Samuel 28:3.SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.13*

Of the prophet Elisha the simple record is:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.14*

"And Elisha died, and they buried him." *2 Kings 13:20.SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.15*

This list might be lengthened indefinitely, for of all the thousands of millions people who have lived on this earth, there have been but two of whom it could be said, "And he died." These are the words which closed each of the biographies (with one exception) in the fifth chapter of *Genesis*. But we have selected only a few of whom it could not by any possibility be denied that they were saints.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.16*

Now what shall we conclude? Shall we say that the correspondent of the *Advocate* is correct? If we do, then we contradict the record concerning all those holy men. This we dare not do; so we shall have to conclude that the writer whom we quoted is misinformed.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.17*

But why should he be misinformed? And why should thousands of others coincide with him in his disagreement with Scripture? For there is not a doubt but that more than nine-tenths of the professed Christians of the world, including theological professors and ministers of the gospel, would never think of questioning his statement. We repeat, Why should they be misinformed? What excuse can they have for flatly contradicting the Bible? We confess that we cannot frame any excuse for them. They can read and the ability to do that is all that is required in order for one to know that both good and bad do die. Nay, it is not even

necessary to be able to read, to know this fact, for observation teaches it to everyone. "For he seeth that wise men I, likewise the fool and the brutish person perish, and leave their wealth to others." *Psalm 49:10*. And there is no man so powerful that he can redeem his brother "that he should live forever, and not see corruption." *Verses 6-9. SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.18*

Then why will they persist in using such language? If they were blatant infidels, denying the Bible, and even in their mad blindness denying their own existence, we should not be surprised. But it is astonishing that men who profess to love the Bible as the inspired word of God, should so squarely contradict it. The only explanation that we can give is that, not heeding the warning of the apostle, they have been spoiled "through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." *Colossians 2:8*. Can anybody give a better explanation? *W. SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.19*

"A Superstitious Practice" The Signs of the Times, 13, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

The religion journals and teachers of the day have much to say about a slavish obedience to forms, urging that the observance of forms is utterly opposed to the spirit of the gospel. Such language is heard especially whenever anything is said about keeping the Sabbath "according to the commandment," being "*buried with Christ by baptism into death*," and sometimes even in regard to the Lord's Supper. The keeping of the seventh day of the week, as the Lord enjoins, is said to be a Judaistic regard for mere form; and whenever it is shown that nothing but immersion is baptism, they will say that to put so much stress upon mere form savors of superstition. We notice, however, that those who thus deprecate form connection with Sabbath observance and baptism, are very zealous sticklers for Sunday observance, and for sprinkling in place of baptism. The natural conclusion is that they have no objection to forms, so long as those forms are of their own choosing. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.20*

Not only is this conclusion just, but it may also be shown that those who thus insist that the form is of no consequence, are indeed most superstitious in their observance of certain forms that are not commanded, and that they regard a mere ceremony much as the heathen regards a charm or an amulet. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.21*

That this is true of the entire Catholic world, needs no proof. It is only necessary to remind the reader of the "relics" which is claimed are possessed of such wonderful healing properties, and of the sign of the cross and the *Ave Marias* which alone are said to ward off all evil spirits. And instance of this superstitious trust in a mere form recently came to our notice in Oakland. A laborer was caught in the shaft of a mill, and was fatally injured. He was carried to the hospital in an unconscious condition, from which he never recovered. A priest was summoned, who administered the "sacrament" of extreme unction to the unconscious man, who died soon after. If that "sacrament" had not been administered, all Catholics would have entertained at least a doubt as to that man's future; but having received it, the priest can assure them that he is sure of Heaven! *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.22*

Now no intelligent, candid person would dare affirm that "extreme unction" or anything else performed over a man who is really dead so far as consciousness is concerned, could have the least effect on his spiritual condition. Even Catholics themselves, when pressed, will admit that the performance of rites and ceremonies, or the repetition of prayers, is of no avail if unaccompanied by faith. And yet thousands of professed Protestants, who talk so glibly about the slavish obedience to mere form, show themselves to be as superstitious as their Catholic brethren from whom they have borrowed those forms. In proof of this, we will cite only the so-called baptism of infants. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.23*

As a matter of fact, infants are never baptized except in the Greek Church; they are only sprinkled; but if we did not know how easy it is to be inconsistent, we should wonder that people who argue against immersion, on the ground that the form is of no consequence, and that baptism is simply "the answer of a good conscience," should be so scrupulous in regard to a mere form where it is impossible that there should be any conscience at all. Two instances will suffice to show that infant baptism is simply the result of gross superstition that is not exceeded among Roman Catholics. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.24*

In a recent note on "Children's Day," the editor of the *Congregationalist* said:- *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.25*

"The rite of infant baptism can be made most impressive. Last year a young man of more than twenty, witnessed this ordinance for the first time on Children's Day. As he watched the pastor take one dear little one after another in his arms to bless them, he said, with deep emotion, 'If my father and mother had done that when I was a baby, I might have been a different boy.'" *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.26*

If the intelligence indicated by that remark was a fair sample of the product of the brain of that "young man of more than twenty," we should say that he was even then a proper subject for the administration of "infant baptism." But we must remember that he simply echoed the sentiments of the church people around him, and that his remark is indorsed by the editor of the *Congregationalist*. Now we ask, What would have been the difference if that young man had been "baptized" when he was a baby? If that ceremony had been performed, and he had been a model youth, to what would the *Congregationalist* attribute his goodness? It could not be to any volition on his part, but simply to the magic charm of the few drops of water sprinkled upon him, or to the words uttered by the pastor. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.27*

But we have another case in which the element of superstition is so prominent as to be laughable. In the *Advance* of September 22, A. L. Frisbie, D. D., has an account of a "Sunday with the Stonies," a tribe of Indians on their reservation near the line of the Canadian Pacific, who have been civilized by missionary effort. He tells of the crowds that flocked to church, of the good order, of the reverence during prayer, and of the enthusiasm with which they sang "Old Hundred," and continues: "A baby was presented for baptism after the benediction. Fortunately he was asleep, so that he could not express any disapprobation of the proceeding." And then in all seriousness he goes on to say that mothers and nurses might learn a lesson from the way in which this baby was "put up," because he was placed in a casket shaped to the tiny form, the whole wrapped and bound, and his limbs, body, and head so snugly cased and held, that he "could not kick if he wanted to." If he had been awake, he could not have objected to the proceeding except by yelling. "Fortunately he was asleep," and so the beautiful ceremony was not marred. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.28*

Will anybody tell us how much more solemnity or efficacy there was in that ceremony than in the incantations of the heathen Indian "Medicine Man"? If it is said that this was done in the name of Christ, then we reply that it was simply taking the name of Christ as a charm, and differed not a particle from the act of the seven sons of Sceva. See *Acts 19:13, 14*. We may add, also, that the mere calling of the name of the Lord Jesus over a person, will have no more effect if done by a Christian minister than if done by a Jewish exorcist. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.29*

In the instance quoted from the *Advance* the climax of absurdity was reached. There was an intent without power to discern between its right hand and its left; added to this it was bound hand and foot, and then while it was asleep the minister surreptitiously sprinkled a few drops of water upon it, and, behold, it was a Christian baby! This fairly surpasses the method by which the Jesuit missionaries in California converted the Indians a century ago. It is said that the Jesuits which would mount their horses, lasso an Indian, force him into the mission building, and "baptize" him, and henceforth he was a child of the church. If sprinkling an unconscious infant is productive of any good, we cannot see what argument can be brought against the forcible "baptism" of adults. No one can fail to see that the element of faith is entirely excluded. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 614.30*

But it is urged when the child is thus baptized, the parents pledge themselves to train it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and to bring it up in the full fellowship of the church. This is not true. The parents may indeed make the pledge, but it is not the so-called baptism that seals the pledge. If it had anything whatever to do with the pledge, then the parents themselves should receive the ceremony in token thereof. Would not the pledge be just as valid if the ceremony of sprinkling was not performed? Certainly; the sprinkling of the infant can by no means affect the parents; so we see still that the act is one of conformity to a superstition. To make this still more emphatic, we have only to cite the numerous cases that are related, where the child sought the company of the vicious as soon as it arrived at years of understanding, and at an early age left home and parents for a wild career, yet after many years he was converted, because he had been sprinkled in infancy. In such a case the same virtues is attributed to the so-called baptism that the savage attributes to the spell of the sorcerer. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 615.1*

But again, it will be said that in such a case the prayer of the parents fail to bring the erring one into the fold, even though he be absent from them. Very good; we know that "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," and we are willing to accept that explanation and the cause of the young man's conversion; but that explanation nullifies the theory that the sprinkling in infancy was of any virtue. Would not the prayers of the parents be just as effectual without the mockery of "baptizing" an unconscious babe? The assumption on the part of the Pedobaptists who relate such cases, is that they would not be; and so again we see that some mysterious magic charm is attributed to the ceremony performed in infancy. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 615.2*

We have before us an article from the *Advance* of July 7, which tells of a very godless man whose wife had died, leaving two very young babes, twins. Two neighboring children became interested in the twins, and desire to have them "baptized," but the father refused his consent. Finally, as he was about to go to the far West, he gave a grudging consent to have the ceremony performed, but said that it should not be done in a church, and that no clergyman should come into his house. The writer relates the brother's delight at the

consent gained, and says:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 615.3*

"Hurrying home, the young churchman told his sister of his success, adding, 'And you and I must be sponsors.' The sister, though sharing his delight and the prospect of bringing these little ones into the fold, shrink from the responsibility of a god-parent where there seemed so little opportunity to fulfill the duties of the office. 'We can pray for them,' was the brother's answer."*SITI October 6, 1887, page 615.4*

Accordingly the ceremony was performed at the home of the brother and sister, and a few days later the babies were taken away, and were not heard of again until twenty years later, when the brother and sister learned that they were active church workers. The writer closes his narrative with the following moral:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 615.5*

"We who are god-parents may not always be able to use personal influence, or make direct appeal to those for whom we are to take care. But these means failing our honest effort, there remains one mighty resource: *We can pray for them.*"*SITI October 6, 1887, page 615.6*

Of course you can; and you could pray for them just as well if they had not been sprinkled. To say that this is not so is to say the sprinkling acts as a charm.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 615.7*

We have said that this anxiety for the "baptism" of infants, so that they may be sure to be saved, is a superstition. To show that this is the correct term for it, we quote Webster's definition of superstition: "Extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious rites not commanded." Some may claim that their scruples for infant "baptism" are not extreme or unnecessary; but we hold that the observance, to any extent, of rites not commanded, is unnecessary, and that if stress is laid on them, as though they were necessary to salvation, then it is superstition.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 615.8*

We believe that baptism is necessary, for the Lord has commanded it. We would not dare tell any individual that he could be saved without it; indeed, we should tell him that he could not, if, knowing the commands and having the opportunity, he should refuse. But while it becomes us to be baptized, thus to fulfill all righteousness, we remember that "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness;" that there can be no righteousness without belief, and that only "he that *believeth and is baptized*, shall be saved." We do not decry the observance of forms, if those forms have been commanded. There is no element of superstition in humble obedience to a divine command, no matter how trivial the required act may seem. But when there is no obedience, because there is no command; when, even if there is a command, the act is done by proxy; and when there cannot by any possibility be either belief or obedience, then we say that devotion to a form is gross superstition, and can result only in evil, for no superstition is harmless. W.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 615.9*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

The Tennessee camp-meeting will be held October 18-25, at Springfield.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.1*

The Seventh-day Adventist General Conference for 1887 will convene in Oakland, Cal., November 15*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.2*

As the California camp-meeting begins the day this number of the SIGNS goes to press, and continues eleven days, there will be no paper next week. The next number will be dated October 20.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.3*

Wong Chin Foo has contributed an article to the *North American Review*, entitled, "Why Am I a Heathen?" The article is very long, but we have read it through, and are sure that it could all have been answered in one sentence, namely, "Because I don't know any better."*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.4*

Doesn't it seem strange that almost the first thing a man does when he sets out to prove that the first day of the week is the Sabbath, is to argue that there isn't any Sabbath at all, and that it doesn't make any difference what day a person keeps, or whether he keeps any and all makes no difference whatever, provided he is only fully persuaded in his own mind? Can anybody wonder that Sunday is losing its hold, and that the ministers are loudly clamoring for a State or national law to compel people to keep that day?*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.5*

One Mrs. J. B. Rideout has been *riding out* and around, the past summer, in California; and through the columns of the *Occident* is telling about it. Of the size of the towns, she gives exceptionally definite information: as for instance, Cloverdale is a "thrifty little village," and "Healdsburg is considerable larger than Cloverdale." Of the people her estimation is equally definite, and as charitable as it is definite. Writing of

Healdsburg she say:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.6*

"Here the Seventh-day Adventists have their stronghold. Disregarding the sanctities of the glorious Lord's-day, they, like the Jews-who do not believe in the divinity of Christ-keep Saturday instead of Sunday."*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.7*

How beautifully the grace of charity shines through some people, especially if they be "orthodox!"*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.8*

A meeting of the Executive Committee of the National Reform Association was held in Pittsburg, September 15. The Pittsburgh *Times* of the 16th give us the following notice of the meeting:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.9*

"The Executive Committee of the National Reform Association held a meeting in the afternoon and evening yesterday at the Y.M.C.A. rooms. Several reports were read and accepted and arrangements were made to continue not less than seven district secretaries in the field. It was also decided to employ a secretary to instill into the foreign population a due regard for Sunday observance. Professor McAllister, who will visit Europe next year, was empowered to use his efforts to bring about an International Congress of the friends of Christian civil government. Arrangements were also made to hold a National Reform Training School at Lakeside next summer, under the direction of Dr. McAllister."*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.10*

We have no doubt that Professor McAllister will meet with a cordial reception from the officials of the national churches of Europe. But the most cordial of all receptions received there we expect will be that which will be given to him by the Pope; especially as he goes carrying the commission of Dr. Herrick Johnson, Joseph Cook, and their *conferees* of the Saratoga Conference, to bring to the attention of Roman Catholic authorities the matter of using the Catholic Bible in the public schools of the United States, wherever the Catholics are in the majority, and to secure "such a basis of agreement *if possible*." Of course, as they are to bring this to the attention of the "Roman Catholic *authorities*," the proper thing to do is to go to the Pope at once. For isn't he the sole Catholic authority? Dr. McAllister may possibly get the Pope to send a legate to preside at the proposed International Congress.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.11*

One of the most disgusting things we have read lately is the *Christian at Work's* article on "How Do You Treat the Minister," in which it roundly scolds those particular people who object to having the minister smoke in the house. It would have people in the invite the minister to smoke even in the guest chamber or the parlor, because the poor man needs all the solace he can get after his arduous labors! The next request will probably be for entertainers to complete the bar-room arrangements, by freely furnishing beer for the tired minister to sip between his whiffs.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.12*

By the way, we notice in the proceedings of the California M. E. Conference, a resolution asking the General Conference to declare that one who uses tobacco shall not be eligible to the office of bishop. That seems to imply that a smoker may now occupy any position in the M. E. Church. We are glad to see that there is a growing sentiment in that church against the use of tobacco by ministers, but why is it tolerated at all? And if it is desired that bishops shall not use tobacco, why should the use of it by anyone be allowed? Ought a bishop to be better than an ordinary minister?*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.13*

The Pope is a king. He said so himself. And doesn't that prove it? for isn't he infallible? In view of his approaching jubilee Leo XIII. has had struck a number of medals bearing the inscription: "Pope Leo XIII., Pontifex *et rex*." Now *rex* is Latin for king, and that inscription means Pope Leo XIII., Pontiff and king. The Roman police found some of these medals on sale in a shop in the city and promptly confiscated them. At this the Vatican makes a decided protest, and argues that the "law of guaranties" recognizes the Pope's right to the title of the sovereign; and support this argument with the fact that Bismarck in his letter to the Pope about two years ago plainly address him as "sire." Now in the language of courts, "sire" means "sovereign"; and as a king is a sovereign, as Bismarck called the Pope "sire," therefore the Pope is king. Don't you see? But in the argument there is vastly more of spiritual pride, religious despotism, and political arrogance, than there is of logic.*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.14*

The following dispatch from Chicago, dated September 24, tells the story as well as may be:-*SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.15*

"This city has to-day, it is asserted, broken the record in divorce cases. From morning until evening five judges were at work, and over one hundred cases were disposed of. Over two hundred persons, martyrs to wedlock, wanted their matrimonial existence judicially murdered, and four hundred or five hundred sympathizing friends were on hand to witness the executions. It was the biggest day's work the divorce mills have had in a long time. Marriage knots were shattered with more than the usual celerity of the Chicago divorce courts, and for every possible reason. One of the gray-haired judges, after the adjournment of court, shook his head and said that something was surely wrong these days. He didn't know what the world was coming to."*SITI October 6,*

Well might the judge ask what the world is coming to. We think it is fast coming to the state recently desired by the correspondent of an Eastern Spiritualist paper, when the way out of marriage should be as easy as the way in. and that will be a repetition of the times just before the flood, when "they took them wives of all which they chose." *SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.17*

Right in this line was a case which the dispatches relate as recently occurring in Paris. A boy scarcely fifteen years of age, stole 500 francs from his employer, and eloped with a girl of fourteen, with whom he began living in another city. Soon however, a former lover of the girl, aged thirteen, appeared on the scene, when the fifteen-year-old Lothario, thinking that his mistress was unfaithful to him, stabbed her three times, probably fatally. Isn't it time to ask, "What is the world coming to?" *SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.18*

At the celebration of the centennial of the adoption of the Constitution, at Philadelphia last month, the service was opened with a prayer by a Bishop Potter, of the Episcopal Church, and closed by a prayer and the benediction by Cardinal Gibbons. Because Cardinal Gibbons was invited too, and did, perform this part of the ceremony the *Presbyterian Journal* says that its "Protestant blood boils." But if Cardinal Gibbons had not been chosen at all, and Bishop Potter had both opened and closed the ceremonies, then it is altogether likely that the "Protestant blood" of the *Presbyterian Journal* would not have been increased in temperature to any perceptible degree. While if the Presbyterian preacher had only been chosen in the place of Cardinal Gibbons, it is safe to say that the "Protestant blood" of the *Journal* would have been so perfectly cool that we might fairly conclude that it was actually reduced below the normal temperature. But the Commission had just as much right to choose Cardinal Gibbons as it had to choose Bishop Potter, or anybody else, to pray. This was a celebration of the adoption of the Constitution. The Constitution recognizes no one profession of religion above another, therefore the Commission had perfect right to choose whom they please, or to choose nobody, to pray, and nobody has any business to object. The boiling of the Protestant blood of our Presbyterian contemporary is only a tempest in a teapot. But even this small tempest shows the excellent wisdom of the makers of our Constitution, in forbidding forever the application of any religious test by the nation to its employees, and in forbidding the National Legislature to make any "law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It is a happy thing for the nation that there is no constitutional channel through which the Protestant blood of the *Presbyterian Journal* may pour its boiling zeal. And it will be a woful day whenever such a channel shall be created. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.19*

Dr. McGlynn's influence is growing. September he delivered an address, of an hour and a half, before the New York Association of Methodist ministers. There were five hundred ministers present beside others. The report further says:- *SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.20*

"He presented the Henry George land theories and defended them as representing the cause of humanity. When the speaker had concluded, a resolution of thanks to Dr. McGlynn was offered for his able, eloquent, and instructive address, and wishing him God-speed in his efforts to diffuse the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. This created great confusion, and after a turbulent scene, which one clergyman characterized as resembling a beer garden, the resolution was amended by a clause that allowed the members to reserve the right of individual opinion concerning the land theories. The resolution was then adopted." *SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.21*

With the fast-growing creed of the worldly power and political preference already displayed by Protestant preachers, we should not be surprised to see yet the Henry George land theories adopted by them, especially in the National Reform compact. *SITI October 6, 1887, page 624.22*

October 20, 1887

"Short-sighted Reasoning" The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

Quite recently we read an article entitled "Keeping the Sabbath-day Not a Success," written by one who was himself once a Sabbath-keeper. The writer spoke of the greater number of Sunday-keepers, and mentioned the other points of a superior prosperity on the part of Sunday-keepers over Sabbath-keepers, and said:-*SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.1*

"If, now, keeping Saturday is so highly pleasing to God, why does he not prosper it more? If Sunday observance is such a sin in the sight of God, why does he so remarkably bless those who persist in it?"*SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.2*

This is one of the most common arguments against the Sabbath-keeping and in favor of Sunday observance, and it is an argument that doubtless carries more weight with than any other. The reason for this is that it is more easily comprehended than any other; it does not require a logical mind to grasp it. But the style of the argument is by no means new, and we would like to refer our readers, who may be troubled over it, to an instance of the use of exactly the same argument about twenty-five hundred years ago. The circumstances were these:*SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.3*

A number of the Jews, disregarding the express command of the Lord, had gone down to Egypt to live, and had fallen in with the customs of the country, and were burning incense to the Egyptian gods. Jeremiah, being divinely inspired, expostulated with them for their wickedness, reminding them of the judges that had been brought upon Israel in the past, for departing from God, and saying that God would bring similar punishments upon them.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.4*

"Then all the men which knew that their wives had burned incense unto other gods, and all the women that stood by, a great multitude, even all the people that dwelt in the land of Egypt, in Pathros, answered Jeremiah, saying, as for the word that thou hast spoken unto us in the name of the Lord, we will not hearken unto thee. But we will certainly do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth, to burn incense unto the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, as we have done, we, and our fathers, our kings, and our princes, in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem; for then had we plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil. But since we left off to burn incense to the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and by the famine."*Jeremiah 44:15-18. SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.5*

This is a fair specimen of worldly reasoning,-of the reasoning of those who think that all accounts must be settled as they go along. The psalmist came very near making the same mistake once. Said he:-*SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.6*

"But as for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the foolish, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked." *Psalms 73:2, 3. SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.7*

And then he goes on to tell how that they have no bands and death, they are not in trouble as other men are, and they have more than heart can wish. But when he went into the sanctuary and understood their end, he learned that God does not settle up his accounts with people as they go along. The people who seemed the most prosperous may be in the greatest danger.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.8*

If prosperity in Sunday-keeping proves that God is pleased with that practice, then the prosperity of the Jews, when they were worshiping idols, proved that God was pleased with such practices. But everyone will say that God was not pleased with them, even though they enjoyed a temporary prosperity. How did they know that? Because God said so; the first commandment forbids the worship of other gods, and the second commandment declares that he cannot endure idolatry. In the same way we know that God is not pleased with Sunday-keeping, even though those who practice it may have prosperity. His commandment enjoins the observance of the Sabbath of the Lord,-the seventh day of the week, the only Lord's day,-and he is pleased only when his commandment is obeyed.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.9*

The fact is, that wealth and numbers are not real success and prosperity. It cannot be known in this life whether or not any man has made life a success. The successful life is that one which is crowned with life eternal. Only when the Lord comes, and brings to light the hidden things of darkness, and makes manifest the counsels of the heart, will it be known who has made a success of life, or what course of action has been crowned with success. But we may know now what course of action, if faithfully persisted in, will be crowned with success, for God's word tells us: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Therefore, let no

one be turned aside from this course by the prosperity of those who are walking in a way of their own choosing. There prosperity is not real, only seeming. "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" *W.SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.10*

"The California Camp-Meeting" The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting began Thursday evening, October 6, and is just drawing to close as we write this report, Monday night, October 17. By unanimous vote of the congregation the meeting was held one day longer than the original appointment, and yet it seemed too short for all that needed to be done. In some respects this was one of the most successful camp-meetings ever held in California. The weather was all that could be desired. A hot north wind, the first three days of the meeting, caused some discomfort; but we have never attended a meeting where the weather was more uniformly fine. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.11*

The meeting was the largest one ever held on the Pacific coast. Besides the large preaching pavilion, there were three hundred and ten tents pitched. Of this number one tent, 50x77 feet in size, was used for children's meetings, and for the primary divisions of the Sabbath-school; another, 50x70 feet in size, was divided into twenty apartments for lodgers; a sixty-foot tent served as a bookstand. When the vote was taken last year to purchase a tent 100x150 feet in size, many thought that the move was a little wild, but this meeting proved that it was bought none too soon. On the second Sunday, when Sister White spoke from *Matthew 6:24-34*, the tent was filled to its utmost capacity, and a large crowd stood outside. A census taken in the early part of the meeting. Showed that twelve hundred and fifty people were encamped; but it afterwards transpired that a few tents have been missed, and quite a number came to the ground afterward. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.12*

The presence of Brother and Sister White, right after the meeting had been in progress four days, added much to the interest of the meeting. Indeed, the large attendance was mostly due to the fact that it had been announced that Sister White would be present. On this account many came who had never attended a camp-meeting before. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.13*

We have never before held a meeting in California which was so well advertised, nor one which was so well planned in all its arrangements. The restaurant tent was arranged so that the helpers could perform their work with less inconvenience than usual; and the healthful food which was prepared was highly appreciated. Two electric lights in the preaching tent, and three more at convenient places outside, afforded all the light that was needed, and saved much trouble that is usually spent in caring for lamps. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.14*

The spiritual interests of the people were looked after as being the main object of the meeting. The large amount of business connected with the Conference, Tract Society, and Sabbath-school, gave less time for this, and for instruction in various branches of work that was desired, yet there were some precious seasons. On each Sabbath of the meeting several hundred came forward in response to a call for those who wished the prayers of God's people, and the work for them was carried on in the various districts into which the campus was divided. Thirty-nine were baptized, and nearly as many more candidates will be baptized at their home churches. Twice each day a meeting was held for the children, in which many sought and found the Saviour. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.15*

There was a seeming break in one portion of the meeting, owing to dissatisfaction which the devil had been planting in the minds of some of the brethren; but a thorough investigation resulted in establishing the confidence of the people and the work to a degree probably never before felt; so that although there was some time seemingly lost, all felt that great advancement had been made. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.16*

Sister White eloquently presented the needs of the missions in Europe, and the difficulties under which the work there is struggling, and the people responded with pledges and cash donations to the amount of over \$8,500 beside, a goodly amount of jewelry. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.17*

The Sabbath-schools held on the ground were most interesting. The membership the first Sabbath was 1,156, but on the second Sabbath there were 1,307 in the school, and the number of classes was 181. The class contributions the first Sabbath amounted to \$207.75, and the second Sabbath to \$213.65, making a total of \$421.40, which all goes to the South Africa Mission. It being seen that the \$1,000 pledged to the African mission by the Association at last year's session, would be more than doubled by the close of the present year, it was voted by the association to donate at least \$2,500 of the Sabbath-school contributions for 1888 to the city mission recently started in London, England, provided the International Association would consent. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.18*

The camp was thoroughly canvassed, and many subscriptions were taken for the various periodicals, but the

number has not been ascertained at present writing. The cash sales at the bookstand amounted to over \$850, besides the orders which were taken. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.19*

The secretary's report showed a marked increase in the amount of tithes paid in the Conference, there being more than \$12,200 more this year than last year. If the brethren and sisters shall remember the earnest exhortation that was given them on the matter of bringing all the tithes into the storehouse, and also resolutions which they made, as we believe they will, we may see a much greater increase next year. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.20*

It was with regret that the Conference and Tract Society dropped Elder Haskell from the presidency, but it was felt to be imperative, as his full attention will be taken up for the next year at least with the work in England. He has labored long and faithfully for the cause in California, and has taught the people how to work. He will ever be held in loving remembrance, and will be heartily welcomed back whenever his duties will permit him to return. Our prayers shall go up for him and the work in which he is engaged, and we know that he will not forget the work here, even if he is not officially connected with it. The brethren and sisters leave for their homes with good courage in the Lord, determined to gain daily victories by his help. *W. SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.21*

"Bible Study" The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

There is a vast difference between reading and studying. A person may read the Bible through a hundred times and still know really nothing about it, and may not be able to quote a single verse correctly. To learn a passage or chapter by heart, even, is not necessarily studying; it may be simply parrot work. To study means to closely examine; to apply the mind to a certain thing; to read and examine for the purpose of learning or understanding. A person may be able to relate, when questioned, everything that is recorded in a certain chapter, without having given it any real study. He may learn the bare facts without that close examination that is required to understand the lesson which they are designed to convey. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 630.22*

A person has learned a thing only when he has made it his own—a part of himself; when he can add to things which he has previously learned, and see the relation between them; or when he has it fixed in his mind as a nucleus, around which to gather other facts. The Bible is a book in which the writings of many individuals, covering many hundreds of years, unite to form one harmonious whole. All the different Bible writers have one common object in view; there is a oneness of purpose seen in all their writings. No one portion of the Bible can be isolated from the rest, and its meaning be fully grasped. It is only when we compare Scripture with Scripture, that we get the full benefit of Bible study. If the text of a Sabbath-school lesson is found in a certain chapter, and the pupil confines his attention to that chapter alone, he has not thoroughly studied his lesson. The texts bearing on one subject should be treasured up in the mind, and others added to them, and woven together like the various threads of a fabric, till the whole subject stands out clear and distinct. Then the relation of different subjects should be kept in mind. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 631.1*

In this way a given amount of study will accomplish vastly more good than the same amount of study without any definite purpose. Of course it will take time to arrive at even a moderate understanding of all the great truths of God's word, and for this very reason the time should be improved to the best advantage. With persevering study, however, and the wisdom which is promised to those who pray in faith, even the most unlearned may become acquainted with the Holy Scriptures, which alone are able to make us "wise to salvation"—"thoroughly furnished unto of good works." *W. SITI October 20, 1887, page 631.2*

"Brief Comments" The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

THE CHARGE TO JOSHUA

The number of times that the Lord tells Joshua to be strong and of good courage is worthy of note. After telling him that he will be with him even as he was with Moses, and that he will not fail him, the Lord says, "Be strong and they could courage" (*chapter 1:6*) then follows the assurance that he shall divide the land among the Israelites. In the next verse he says again, "Only be thou strong and very courageous." Then follows an admonition to do according to all that was written in the law, and to meditate upon that day and night; and then exhortation is again given: "Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed." *SITI October 20, 1887, page 631.3*

The Lord does not desire that his people should give way to discouragement. The same exhortation that was

addressed to those who were about to enter into the earthly Canaan, is applicable to the Israel of God, who are striving for an inheritance in the heavenly Canaan. "Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed." Why not to be discouraged? Are we not weak? and is not our enemy powerful? Would it not be presumptuous in us to feel strong and confident? Yes; it would if we depended only on our own strength; but unfortunately we have also the same promise that was made to Joshua. It is this: "For the Lord thy God is with thee whithersoever thou goest." And he has also said, "I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee." The Christian should ever realize this glorious truth: "The eternal God is my refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." Knowing this, how can he become discouraged? The apostles exhortation is, "Be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might." *Ephesians 6:10. SITI October 20, 1887, page 631.4*

HOLY THINGS

It is sometimes claimed that there is no such thing as holy time; that is absurd to think that one day is really any better than another; that men can make any day a holy Sabbath by resting upon it. It would be interesting to hear such ones explain *Joshua 5:15*. The case is similar to that of Moses at the burning bush. Joshua had seen the man standing by Jericho, and had learned that he was the "captain of the host of the Lord." "And the captain of the Lord's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest holy. And just what did so." Now did the ground become holy because Joshua took off his shoes, or was it holy before? The answer is, It was holy before, for the Lord said so. Then it seems that there may be a difference between things of the same kind. There was no outward difference between the ground on which Joshua was standing and the ground in other places, yet there was a difference. One was holy, on account of the presence of the Lord, the other was not. The ground on which Joshua stood would have remained holy even if he had not removed his shoes. So it is with the Sabbath. The Lord has made it holy, and it will remain holy whether man regards it or not. The failure to discriminate between the holy and the profane is that which brings the judgments of God upon mankind. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 631.5*

THE MIRACLE AT GIBEON

"Then spake Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies." "So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day." Some, in their eagerness to overthrow the Sabbath of the Lord, have found in this occurrence a loss of time. But there was no time lost. It was simply a lengthening of the day. If such a miracle should occur on the Sabbath, it would simply lengthen the Sabbath. Two days were not combined in one, but it was one long day. "And there was no day like that before it or after it." *SITI October 20, 1887, page 631.6*

Skeptics find an abundance of food for caviling in this miracle, as, indeed, they may in any. But the Bible student need not be troubled about it. To say that it could not occur, is in reality to deny that God is the creator of the heavens and the earth; for if God made the planets it is certain that he can control them. It is said that God instituted fixed laws by which they should be governed. Very true; but did he put those laws out of his own power? The maker of a threshing machine designs that it shall work according to a certain plan; yet he can stop the machine without altering the plan. One thing is certain; the universe did not create itself. Although the mind of man cannot conceive of its extent, nor fathom the laws by which it is governed, there must be a Creator who is infinitely greater than the universe. "He taketh up the isles as a very little thing." It is evident that the Creator can do as he pleases with what he has created. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 631.7*

To disbelieve in miracles is to deny the existence of God, for God would cease to be God if he did not work miracles. Do you inquire how this can be? Simply thus: A miracle is a wonder,- something beyond the comprehension of those who witness it. It is entirely contrary to any laws of nature of which we have any knowledge. Even with this definition there are miracles constantly taking place around us, for no man can explain the one-hundredth part of the physical phenomena which are matters of common observation. Now to say that God cannot perform a miracle is equivalent to saying that he cannot do anything that finite men cannot understand. In other words, it is saying that God is altogether such an one as ourselves. It is a deplorable fact that many professed believers in God and his word will throw discredit upon both by attempting to "explain" miracles. We know not which to pity the more, their ignorance or their presumption. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 631.8*

If it is asked how it is possible that such a miracle as the stopping of the sun could be performed without disarranging the whole planetary system, I would reply, "I do not know; I cannot imagine; if I could, it would cease to be a miracle." The disbelieve in miracles arises from the fact that men are too proud to acknowledge that there is anything which they cannot understand. He who believes only what he can comprehend and explain will have a very short creed. It is no shame for man to confess that he cannot by searching by about God. *W. SITI October 20, 1887, page 631.9*

E. J. Waggoner

"My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." This Scripture should fill every follower of Christ with encouragement. So long as they hear his voice, and follow where it leads, they are safe. No one, not even Satan, can snatch them away. God is "greater than all." Though trials and temptations become, "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it." *1 Corinthians 10:13*. Christ also says: "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world." *John 16:33*. And to strengthen the assurance, he adds: "I and my Father are one." When both the Father and the Son unite for man's salvation, what confidence may we feel! *SITI October 20, 1887, page 632.1*

But while we gain courage from the fact that he is "able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him," we are not to be presumptuous. Jesus said, "No man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand," but he did not say that no man could take himself out. This Scripture has been perverted, and made to teach that no follower of Christ can fall away. That this view is incorrect, is shown by many passages. We are exhorted thus: "Hold that fast which thou hast, at no man take thy crown." *Revelation 3:11*. We are told also, "He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." *Matthew 24:13*. For a positive testimony, see *Hebrews 6:4-6*. Our Lord says also: "If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." *John 15:6*. See also *Revelation 4:2-5; 3:16*. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 632.2*

The case, then, stands thus: So long as we hear the voice of Christ, and are content to follow him, trusting him humbly and implicitly, no harm can befall us; his strength will enable us to repel all attacks; but when we begin to trust ourselves, we take ourselves out of his hands; or, if refusing longer to listen to his voice, we are cast out. Let us all heed the words of the apostle Paul: "Because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear." *W. SITI October 20, 1887, page 632.3*

"Not a Prophet, But an Angel" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

In a Spiritualist contemporary we find the following:--*SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.1*

"Did not the angel that appeared to Saul declare that he was one of his brethren the prophets?" *SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.2*

We once heard of a hackman who attempted to pass himself off as a Quaker at the time of a convention of Friends, in order that he might secure their patronage. He succeeded so far as to give his carriage filled with the visiting Friends, but when he came and asked, "Where's thous baggage?" they saw that he was unfamiliar with the language of Quakers, and, disgusted with the attempted deception, at once sought another conveyance. In like manner the question above quoted shows that the writer, in attempting to prove Spiritualism from the Bible, has no knowledge of the book. We don't remember that we ever saw in an infidel or Spiritualist paper a correct reference to any biblical event. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.3*

But the substitution of Saul for John is not so bad as is the statement that the angel declared himself to be one of the prophet's brethren; and in this version of *Revelation 22:9* he who finds himself in a company with a great many professed Bible Christians. And just because there are hundreds of professed Bible Christians who actually taken the Spiritualist ground that the angel who talked with John was one of his fellow-prophets, we will tell just what the angel did declare himself to be. The following is a literal translation of the Greek of *Revelation 22:9*:--*SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.4*

"And he said to me: See (thou do it not) for I am a fellow-servant of thee and of thy brethren the prophets," etc. The revised version has it: "For I am a fellow-servant with thee, and with thy brethren the prophets." The simple meaning is that he was not one to be worshipped, but was a fellow-servant not only of John, but of all the prophets, and of those also who should keep the sayings the book. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.5*

We cannot accuse the Spiritualist editor of knowing better than to quote the text the way he did, for he did not know where the passage is, nor to whom the words were spoken. But we are sometimes forced to question the honesty of ministers of the gospel, whose title of "D.D." ought to signify that they have at least read the Bible through, and that they know how to translate easy Greek, who will refer to the angel of *Revelation 22:9* as one of the old prophets. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.6*

Our Spiritualist editor will no doubt say, "Well, the text doesn't amount to anything anyway, because we are not dependent on the Bible for our knowledge." Then why try to make it appear that it teaches Spiritualism? The reason is, that by so doing some professed Christians may be led to wholly accept that delusion, thinking that the Bible favors it. As a matter of fact, there is not a text in the Bible which gives the slightest countenance to Spiritualism; noonday sunlight and midnight darkness are not more opposite than are the Bible and that the doctrine. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.7*

"Too Significant to Be Pleasant" The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

The following protest we clip from the *Christian Union*, which says that it was written by "a leading Protestant divine." The protest is just and timely, but that it will have any effect, there is no reason to hope. What indicates this, and also makes the necessity for a protest the more urgent, is the general indifference that is manifested over the matter. The *Christian Union's* report, in the same issue that contains the protest, makes no mention of the occurrence; and the protest itself is put in the most obscure portion of the paper, as though the editors were ashamed or afraid to have it seen, but inserted it out of courtesy to the "leading Protestant divine." Are there not more who will vigorously protest against American subservency to Romish intrigues? or is Protestantism dead? *SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.8*

"The celebration of the centennial of the adoption of our Federal Constitution in Philadelphia was an imposing occasion, and no doubt also a very profitable one for the City of Brotherly Love. All the exercises were on a scale commensurate with the greatness of the occasion, and were all successfully carried out. The appropriateness of the monster industrial and military parades, the reception of the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania and of the President of the United States, appealed to everyone's patriotism. But there was one feature of the celebration made unduly prominent, that impressed many as utterly incongruous and out of place, and that was the place taken by the Roman Catholics as a religious denomination. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.9*

"The formal reception given by Cardinal Gibbons placed him and his co-religionist in a false position before the American people. Why should he have assumed or been granted a more prominent part than any Presbyterian minister or Episcopalian or Methodist bishop? Why should he have had any part as the express representative of a religious denomination, especially on such an occasion, when the adoption of an instrument was celebrated, one of whose chief glories is that it acknowledges no ecclesiastical distinctions, and accords absolute religious equality to all? *SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.10*

"The whole affair looked very much as if Cardinal Gibbons appeared as the head and representative of a distinct power on a plane with that of the Governors of the several States; in fact, it made the impression that the Roman Catholic Church was, or aspired to be, an organization political in its character, because putting itself on a part and level with other such organizations-the President representing the Union, Governor Beaver, Pennsylvania, and Cardinal Gibbons, the Roman Catholic Church. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 638.11*

"Is the last-named organization a State within the State? Is it at all analogous to a State of the Union or in the Union? Why was the distinction made for this one denomination more than for any other? Why should it have been made for any? That it appeared very plainly as if some special civil or political significance attached to Cardinal Gibbons and his church no one can doubt who saw the Cardinal in all the glory of his sacred vestments, like a Governor in his uniform, and marked how Mr. Cleveland formally attended his reception just as he did Governor Beaver's. It was very significant to behold on such an occasion 'the head of the nation shake hands with the prince of the church,' as one of the daily papers described the scene. The whole thing was a little too significant to be pleasant." *SITI October 20, 1887, page 639.1*

"Confessing Christ" The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.

Notes on the International Lesson.
(November 6.-Matthew 10:22-42.)

"Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." What is it to confess Christ? This is a most important question, for upon it depends our future happiness or woe. In the parallel passage in *Mark 8:38* we read: "Whosoever therefore shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation; of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he cometh

in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." These texts show the importance of confessing Christ.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 639.2*

Confessing Christ is something more than acknowledging his existence, or that he is the Son of God. Even the devils do this (*Matthew 8:29*), but it does not affect their character, nor will it avert their punishment. Neither does confessing Christ consist in making a high profession of Christianity. For, says Jesus, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity." *Matthew 7:21-23*. Here we learn that those who have not only made a high profession, but who have been apparently shining lights, and have done much work, will be denied by Christ in the last great day. Then it must be because they have not confessed him; for all who confess him will be acknowledged by him. But he who does not confess Christ, denies him, (see *Matthew 12:20*), so that our Saviour's words show us that a man may deny Christ while bearing the Christian name, and being what is called "a pillar in the church."*SITI October 20, 1887, page 639.3*

If now it is desired to know in brief what it is to confess Christ, turn and read *Romans 10:9-11*: "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed."*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.1*

Confessing the Lord Jesus is the outgrowth of a heart belief in him. And what is heart belief in Christ? It is such a belief as produces righteousness, "for with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." The belief that does not produce righteousness, is no belief at all. Righteousness is right-doing. It is the opposite of sin, for unrighteousness is sin. *1 John 5:17*. But sin is the transgression of the law. *1 John 3:4*. Therefore righteousness is obedience to the law of God. So Moses said, "And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us." *Deuteronomy 6:25*. Therefore we may understand that true belief in Christ leads invariably to keeping the commandments of God; and true confession of the Lord Jesus Christ is the utterance of one who has such a living, acting, practical faith in Christ.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.2*

What a wonderful promise, that if we confess him, he will confess us! And what will he confess concerning us when he comes? Here is the answer: "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee." *Hebrews 2:11, 12*. Then when he comes in the glory of the Father, with all the holy angels, Christ will not be ashamed to greet as his brethren all those who have confessed him before men, by their lives of obedience, as well as by their words. He will claim such as members of his own family, heirs of God, and joint heirs with himself. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God." We are now members of the family of Christ. If so, let us heed the apostle's injunction to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called. Let us not disgrace the family, and cause the Head of it to be ashamed of us.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.3*

Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household. *Matthew 10:34-36*.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.4*

Notwithstanding the above statement, it is true that the gospel of Jesus Christ is a "gospel of peace;" and this loving exhortation should be most carefully heeded: "But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." *2 Timothy 2:23-25*.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.5*

And this: "But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." *Matthew 5:39, 44*.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.6*

Then how can there be strife and a sword, as the Saviour said, if these injunctions are followed? They exist just because these injunctions are followed. He does not say that it will be the Christian man who will be at variance with his father. This could not be, for variance is one of the things the possession of which will shut a man out of Heaven. *Galatians 5:19-21*. But men are naturally prone to evil; and they resent anything which condemns their course. So the sinful son will be at variance with his pious father; the father himself will be at peace with all men. "And a man's foes shall be they of his own household." The man will not be a foe to those of his own household, but they will be his foes because of his goodness, just as Stephen was stoned because

he was a Christian; just as Daniel was cast into the den of lions, because he prayed to God; just as "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution," because "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse." *W. SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.7*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

The camp-meeting at Los Angeles, Cal., will begin October 26, and will continue twelve days. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.8*

We read in an exchange that "Yankton has been selected as the Roman Catholic sea for Dakota." We suppose it is called a *sea* because the errors which will be propagated there will drown men in destruction and perdition. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.9*

On page 634 will be found an interesting report from the Central European Mission, by the former editor of the SIGNS, who is now connected with that mission. The laborers in that field have difficulties to contend with of which we in this country realize but little. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.10*

In the *Independent* of August 25, Prof. Norman Fox has a review of Dr. Armitage's "History of the Baptists," in which he says: "As to infant baptism, scores of the ablest Pedobaptist scholars admit that it was unknown in apostolic times, while all know that it was not universal till some centuries after the death of the apostles." *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.11*

This number of the paper is one day late, owing to the fact that nearly all the work done upon it was done during the camp-meeting, which editors, proofreaders, and compositors attended. It was gotten out under high pressure, much of the work being done in the night after meeting; so we beg the indulgence of our readers if it is not up to the usual standard. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.12*

Something must be done for Iowa. Why? Because since the Prohibition amendment was adopted, the supply of convicts for the penitentiary is diminishing, and the contractors of prison labor at Fort Madison are much embarrassed; they don't know how to fill their contracts. There's nothing like an unlimited supply of whisky to keep state prisons full, and to make prison labor contractors happy. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.13*

A correspondent of the *California Christian Advocate* writes to know if the rule of the church requiring members to kneel during prayer in church cannot be changed so as to allow them to sit. He says that only a few old Puritans kneel before the congregation and that he had supposed they do so only out of respect to the rule; also that kneeling has been found to be a great deal of trouble, and there is often more or less damage to the valuable clothing. The tendency seems to be to make even the *form* of worship which is retained as easy as possible. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.14*

Here is a little story that may be read with profit by a good many:—*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.15*

"When Livingstone visited England after his great exploring tour, he was much praised for his sacrifices. It was true he had labored much, but what did he reply to this praise? 'People talk of the sacrifices I made in spending so large a portion of my life in Africa. Can you call that a sacrifice which is only a small payment on that great debt to God which can never be fully discharged? Say, rather, that it is a privilege. I have never made a sacrifice.'"—*Spirit of Missions. SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.16*

And who has made a sacrifice? When we consider the sacrifice of Christ, who, though he was rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich; and remember that "our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory;" who can talk about sacrifices made, much less to boast or mourn over them? *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.17*

In his recent address to the Boston Evangelical Ministers Association, Dr. Josiah Strong related the case of a minister who was pleading with his people for a larger manifestation of sympathy to the poor and destitute around them, when an influential church member rose, and said he wanted none of that class in his pew. The bold rejoinder came at once from him who believed he had been commissioned to preach the gospel to the poor: "I will not cease my plea, till the door of this church swings and to the slightest touch of the needy." As a consequence of the pastor's determination to preach the gospel to the poor, he was dismissed from the church. And yet the members of that church doubtless think that they are followers of Christ; they certainly call themselves Christians. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.18*

A call is being circulated for a conference of all evangelical Christians, at Washington, D. C., December 7, 8, 9, 1887, to study principally the following propositions:—*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.19*

"1. What are the present perils and opportunities of the Christian church, and of the country?*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.20*

"2. Can any of them be met by a hearty co-operation of all evangelical Christians, which, without detriment to any denominational interests, will serve the interests of the whole church?*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.21*

"3. What are the best means to secure such co-operation, and to awaken the whole church to its responsibility?"*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.22*

The call is signed by William E. Dodge, John Jay, C. A. Stoddard, Philip Schaff, Josiah Strong, James McCosh, R. S. Storrs, D. C. Gilman, Timothy Dwight, Howard Crosby, Gen. O. O. Howard, J. H. Vincent Lyman Abbott, W. M. Taylor, and about seventy other ministers and representative laymen. It is expected that at least two thousand delegates will be present.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.23*

We have frequently been accused of a lack of charity, because we have said that Sunday laws are in no sense temperance laws; that the enactment of such laws is solely in the interest of somebody's special religion, and not all in the interest of temperance; and that, in fact, they tacitly admit that the liquor traffic is alright except on Sunday. The following, which is a portion of a much lauded address recently made before the Young Men's Christian Association of Oakland, by the Rev. J. H. Hector, pastor of the African M. E. Church of San Francisco, shows that we have not overstated the case in the least:-*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.24*

"There is needed to tune up the gospel trumpet so that its tones shall sound unmistakably to the world. One thing, and I have noticed it particularly since I came to California, that this gospel trumpet should proclaim is that we must have the Sabbath, and a holy Sabbath. We want you Jews to stop selling second-hand clothing on Sunday. We want you Germans to stop selling your beer and running your beer gardens and picnics on Sunday. We want you Frenchmen to stop selling your wine and strong drink on Sunday. We want all of you who are now raising the devil and destroying our children on Sunday to stop it right off. We want to say to you, that while you may raise the devil and destroy our children six days in the week, you've got to rest on the seventh day [first day] and keep it holy."*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.25*

We have always known that Sunday laws were not in the interests of morality or good order, but solely to gratify prejudice and bigotry; but we never before saw it so directly admitted.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.26*

In his letter to the Corinthians, Paul said: "For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God."*1 Corinthians 1:22-24*. And again he said: "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." *Chap. 2:2*. These words were brought in very forcibly to our mind, by contrast, when we read that two ministers in Oakland, who have the largest congregations of any in the city, preached on a recent Sunday evening to young men upon the "Lessons to be drawn from the life of Governor Bartlett." We do not know anything about the private life of Governor Bartlett; but we do know that if he had been the best man that has lived in the United States since it became a nation, he would not have been good enough to warrant a minister of the gospel in holding him up as a model for young men. Jesus Christ is the only being who ever lived on this earth, whose life is worthy to be taken as a model for men, either young or old, and "Jesus Christ, and him crucified," is the only thing that can draw men to a nobler life. But the trouble is, that the preaching of Jesus Christ and him crucified is not the kind that "takes" with the people, and fills the churches on Sunday nights.*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.27*

"Humbug Legislation" The Signs of the Times, 13, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

The Saturday half-holiday created by the New York Legislature last winter, has proved a failure. Several of the leading papers have referred to it as such. The *Independent* calls it outright, "a legislative humbug," and a "silly law," which is all that it is. The *Observer* says:-*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.28*

"The indications are that the observance of the Saturday half-holiday as a particular institution will have to be abandoned for the present, or postponed until the world has more leisure than it has now. Business men and trades-people generally are revolting against the custom and refusing to observe it any longer. The fact that Saturday afternoon was constituted a legal holiday by the last legislature makes no difference in the aspects of the case except in banks and exchanges. The enactment of the law was plainly a piece of folly and was done simply as a bid for the favor of the so-called 'laboring class' and not from any humane or philanthropic motives."*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.29*

The same Legislature, and for the same reason, also made September 5 a State holiday under the title of "Labor-Day," that is, a day for doing no labor. Of its celebration the reports all show about one way, of which the following account by the *Congregationalist* will give an idea of what Labor-Day amounts to:-*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.30*

"Labor-Day, so called, because so many people quit labor to parade and drink beer and stronger fluids, didn't seem practically to amount to much here. Most of the real workers were at work. A large number of men and boys (some have estimated them as high as 25,000), in a go-as-you-please fashion, to the sound of music, carrying banners and various devices; but people generally showed little interest. A good many employers, pressed for those to fulfill their contracts, were irritated over the loss, and very few of the operators seemed very joyful. They had the air of men doing an uncomfortable duty. There was no violence, and little work for the police; but the lager beer and whisky dealers had all they could do to keep the procession up to the proper marching point, and their arms ached sometime after the show was over." *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.31*

Of both these laws the *Independent* says:-*SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.32*

"The motive prompting the enactment of the Labor-Day Law, like that promoting the enactment of the Saturday Half-holiday Law, was purely political. Governor Hill and the Republican Legislature were fishing for labor votes. This is the whole of it. The next Legislature of this State would to a sensible thing if it were to repeal both of these laws." *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.33*

Of course it would, but it is safe to say that the New York Legislature will do no such sensible thing. It will be much more apt to do more of just such like, "fishing for votes." Nor is the New York Legislature the exception. *SITI October 20, 1887, page 640.34*

October 27, 1887

"Information Wanted" The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

The editor of the *Herald of Truth* in noticing a new addition to Sunday literature, said: "Our belief is that the Sabbath or seven-day worship is an institution as old as creation, yet lifted, in the highest Christian thought, above the formality of days. This we believe to have been the position held by the apostle Paul." *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.1*

Now that the good Doctor who presides over the columns of the *Herald* has begun to making his "confession of faith," we would like to have him go on, and also make more clear a few points in his article, for a confession of faith must of all things be most clear. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.2*

1. "We believe that the Sabbath or seventh-day worship is as old as creation." We will accept that, because we read that "in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." *Exodus 20:11*. Also in *Genesis 2:3* we read "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." If the Doctor had done what we have done for him, viz., given authority, the first part of his statement would have been perfect. Now for the second part. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.3*

2. "Yet [it is] lifted, in the highest Christian thought, above the formality of days." We will quote the statement again in full, that the connection may be seen: "The Sabbath or seventh-day of worship is as old as creation, yet [it is] lifted, in the highest Christian thought, about the formality of days." That is, "the Sabbath or seventh-day worship" has no connection with such formal things as days! Our knowledge of either theology for science is insufficient to enlighten us as to how the Sabbath, requiring seventh-day of worship, can be celebrated on no day at all. We doubt if even the learned editor of the *Herald of Truth* can make this appear. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.4*

This, we are told, is what is accomplished by "the highest Christian thought." Its seems, then, that the office of "the highest [modern] Christian thought" is to lift things from the real to the unreal; from plain common sense into absurdity. Let us try it on the first commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." This is the language of Jehovah, and teaches us that the worship of one God, Maker of heaven and earth, as an institution is as old as creation, and much older; but "the highest Christian thought" would lift this above the formality of any specified object of worship. And so the Hindu, whose highest aspiration is to become lost in contemplation of an idea, is the ideal Christian. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.5*

Try it on the seventh commandment. That commandment guards the marriage relation, which, as an institution, is as old as creation (see *Genesis 2:21-24*); but in "the highest Christian thought" it is lifted above the formality of persons! That is, in "the highest Christian thought" we have seventh day worship without any day at all; we have the worship of one God, without regard to any Being; and we have marriage, without anybody being married! If this be the "highest Christian thought," we will have none of it. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.6*

Why does the Doctor take a position concerning the Sabbath which involves him in such absurdities? Because he doesn't know what else to do. His knowledge of the Bible, and his honesty, will not let him make the claim that Sunday was the original Sabbath, and something else will not lead him acknowledge the fact that seventh-day worship, which is as old as creation, is to endure as long as creation lasts. So he takes a position which involves the keeping of no day at all, and thus stultifies himself in his strict observance of Sunday. We know that he has plenty of company in that position, but we can't imagine how that can help him. If we were on the rack, the fact that a multitude of others were undergoing the same tortures would give us no relief. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.7*

In the same paper from which we extract this partial confession of faith, there is a clipping from the *Occident*, descriptive of the so-called "baptism" of six infants, who, so says the *Occident*, were thus "numbered with the 'household of faith.'" On this is we find the following comment, which we heartily endorse:—*SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.8*

"The *Herald of Truth* wants to know how much faith these six little ones required to belong to the 'household of faith'? The information would be valuable to its readers in this increasingly intelligent age. Or was it *sponsor* faith on the part of parents or guardians? If so, where is the warrant for it in God's word? No twisting of Scripture, brother editors of the *Occident*, no 'suffer little children to come unto me,' is wanted. We are sick of this straining of Scripture 'clean from the purpose' of the text itself. Rise up, brethren of the Presbytery of San

Francisco, like men, and give us your '*Thus saith the Lord*' for 'infant baptism,' or else we will give you a '*Mum Social*,' without the possibility of broken silence." *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.9*

Suppose we administer to the Doctor a dose of his own medicine. The SIGNS OF THE TIMES wants to know how much "Christian thought" there is in an argument for a practice which takes the Sabbath of the Lord, which was declared by Jehovah himself to be "*the seventh day*," and lifts it "above formality of days," and then lets sit down again upon the first day? Where is the warrant for it in God's word? We cannot accuse the *Herald* of "twisting Scripture," for it has not made mention of any. But when it does quote, we want the full force of the text. We, too, are "sick of this straining of Scripture 'clean from the purpose' of the text itself." Hitherto that has been almost the sole dependence of the Sunday cause. Rise up, brethren of the Baptist Church of California, and give us your "*Thus saith the Lord*" for Sunday keeping, or else unite with the Presbytery of San Francisco in their "Mum Social" over infant baptism. *WSITI October 27, 1887, page 646.10*

"Who Is Responsible?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

In a catechism of the Episcopal Church we find the following question and answer: *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.11*

"Q.-What did your sponsors do for you? *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.12*

"A.-They did promise and vow three things in my name:- *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.13*

"First-That I should renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. Secondly-That I should believe all the articles of the Christian faith. And thirdly-That I should keep God's holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life." *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.14*

This, our readers will understand, is the promise that is made at the baptism (sprinkling) of an infant. As we read it, the thought occurred to us that those who make it take a grave responsibility upon themselves. We do not believe that any realize how great that responsibility is. Let us see. The baptism of an individual indicates his death to sin, and his determination to walk, as the apostle says, "in newness of life;" or, as the catechism has it, to "renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh," and to "keep God's holy will and commandments, and walking in the same," all the days of his life. Now is evident that an infant a few days or weeks, or even months old, is not competent to make any such promise. It knows nothing of the sinful works of the flesh, nor of God's holy will and commandments. This is well understood, and therefore his parents, or some other persons of mature age, make the promise for him. These persons are then called that child's sponsors. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.15*

The question now arises, Suppose at the child, as he approaches manhood, does not manifest any disposition to fulfill the vow made for him by his sponsors, who is responsible? Such a case frequently happens. We have personally known many who have been baptized (?) in infancy, who courted "the pomps and vanities of this wicked world," and reveled in "all the sinful lusts of the flesh." It is barely possible that they nominally believed the "articles of the Christian faith;" but their faith was not indicated by works, for they lived and died in open violation of "God's holy will and commandments." Now in such cases are not those who made the vow responsible for its non-fulfillment? The very name that is applied to them—"sponsors"—indicates that they are. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.16*

A sponsor, according to Webster, is "one who holds himself to answer for another, and is responsible for his default." Then those who make the vow above recorded virtually say, "I bind self as the surety that this vow shall be fulfilled in the future life of this infant; if he shall fail to fulfill it, I will do it myself or will suffer the consequences of such failure." But this, as all can see, involves difficulties that cannot be overcome. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.17*

1. It becomes necessary, in case the child proved faithless, for the sponsor to do his duty for him, as well as his own. This, however, is an impossibility, for no man can do more than his own duty. It is upon the supposition that a man may do more than his own duty, that the Catholics base the monstrous doctrine of indulgences. Christ says: "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do." *Luke 17:10. SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.18*

2. "The wages of sin is death;" since the child lives and dies in sin, the one who has pledged himself to become responsible for his failure to live a Christian life, must die in his stead. But here more difficulties present themselves: (a) What is to become of the one in his stead the sponsor dies? He cannot be saved, for

he has never accepted Christ, and "there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." *Acts 4:12*. Then two men must die for the offense of only one. This would be an injustice, and therefore cannot be, for God is just. (b) The sponsor has, perhaps, lived a life of a humble obedience, and faith in Christ; then, according to the promise (*Romans 10:9; Revelation 22:14*), he must be saved. And thus it happens that he must both live and die! His own reward is eternal life, but on account of the sins of the one for whom he became surety, he must suffer eternal death. Impossible. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.19*

3. While there can be no doubt that the sponsor really pledges himself to one or the other of the above-mentioned impossible things, the Bible settles the matter thus: "Behold, all souls our mind; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth *it* shall die." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." *Ezekiel 18:4, 20. SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.20*

Thus we see that in no way is it possible for sponsors to fulfill the vow that they may make at the so-called baptism of an infant. Their action is nothing else than a solemn farce. But does this relieve them entirely from responsibility? By no means. It is not a light thing for one to promise that which he can by no possibility fulfill. If for "every idle word that men shall speak they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment," much more shall they be held to answer if those idle words are in the form of solemn vows? *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.21*

The conclusion which anyone can see should be drawn is that such promises are sinful. "But the child cannot promise for himself to forsake the ways of sin, and what shall be done?" Wait until he has sin to forsake, and then he will be old enough to make the promise to forsake it if he wishes to. If the child is not old enough to make an intelligent choice for himself, he is not old enough to know what sin is, and consequently he needs no baptism. When he is old enough to choose, then he is old enough not to act on his own responsibility, and no others need take the responsibility which they cannot by any possibility discharge. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 646.22*

"But the Saviour says, 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' and how dare we disobey that command?" You need not. "Suffer," that is, allow them to come. Do not throw any obstacle in their way, and you will be obeying it. You may invite them to come, you may urge them to come, but do not think that you can come in their stead. The most that you can do in that line is to set a godly example for them; if this is done, they will undoubtedly come. But the very word "suffer," that is, "permit," "allow," "refrain from hindering," shows that the "little children" referred to are old enough to make a move on their own account, if no obstacle is thrown in their way. Moreover the "baptizing" of infants is in no sense obedience to the Saviour's command, because the infants do not and cannot come to Christ. When Christ says, "Suffer little children to come unto me," he does not mean infants who cannot come to him for the reason that they cannot know and appreciate him. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 647.1*

The inconsistencies herein shown up should convince all of the folly of what is called infant baptism. But the practice is not simply foolish, it is absolutely wicked. It makes people satisfied that they have complied with the divine requirement when they never have, and it fills the professed church with unconverted persons. In fact, the evils that spring from this perversion of the sacred rite are legion. For all of these, we ask, who is responsible? With what words will those who practice infant baptism answer, when the Judge shall ask, "Who hath required this at your hands?" W. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 647.2*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

The Church of the Advent of San Francisco which last year invested \$25,000 in a "paper carnival" to get a return of \$6,500, is just now engaged in another paper carnival, for "charity's sake." We shall see if possible, how the finances of this one will balance. *SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.1*

Ex-Governor St. John is now lecturing in California on his favorite subject, "Prohibition." One evening last week he addressed a large and intelligent audience in Oakland, and made some telling points in favor of constitutional prohibition. Although a church member, he unsparingly scores professed Christians who give any quarter whatever to the liquor traffic. As the late John B. Finch used to say, "A thing is never settled until it is settled right," and "A compromise with evil is a victory for the devil." *SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.2*

Some time ago we received a copy of the *Popular Science Monthly*, accompanied by a postal card stating that the magazine contained some good points which we might be able to use, and requesting that we should return it if we did not use the article. We had already used the article, but we cannot return the magazine, because the sender forgot to sign his name to his postal card, which was mailed from New Orleans. If he will

send his name, with the necessary stamps for the return of the *Monthly*, we shall be most happy to comply with his request.*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.3*

"Fierce" is one of the epithets which the apostle Paul uses in describing the characteristics of the people of the last days, and there is not a daily paper published in the land which does not in every issue record some of the out-croppings of this trait. It is not simply that men are fierce in battle, or for revenge when they have been injured, but that they exhibit their ferocity without any provocation. Even in childhood is being developed to a marked degree as is indicated in the Academy in Alabama, where an extra force of police is found necessary to protect the Jewish pupils from the causeless abuse of their companions.*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.4*

On Sunday, October 23, the corner-stone of a Catholic college was laid in Oakland. After the ceremony, Rev. Joseph Sasia, of the Jesuit College in San Francisco, delivered a sermon on education, in which, as a matter of course, he referred to the fact that Catholic schools and churches are taxed, and that the government does not give Catholic schools a share of the public money, and then said: "We earnestly believe that, by the blessing of Providence, our grievances will be redressed, and our just claims shall justly prevail." If the obsequiousness with which the Catholic Church is treated by the political press is any justification, we may well believe that the priest will not have to wait long to see his desire fulfilled.*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.5*

A Catholic speaker said the other day in Buffalo, N.Y., that the Baltimore Plenary Council declared that "to turn the Lord's Day [Sunday is meant] into a day of toil is a blighting curse to a country." When the National Reform Association secures its coveted close alliance with the Romish Church, the decrees of the Baltimore Council will be excellent campaign material. And just as we are writing this note, a grand Catholic procession of military companies, with three brass bands in full blast, is passing,- a part of "the largest demonstration of 'the Church' ever held in Oakland"-it is Sunday too. Yet we are sure that a solitary Seventh-day Adventist who should go quietly about his work of to-day would "disturb" the peoples of Sunday rest more than all this Catholic parade.*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.6*

Unbelievers often charge the Jews with having been the most cruel and blood-thirsty people of all ancient times. It is easy enough to disprove this by a comparison with the doings of the other nations of those times. But on this point we have contemporary evidence, and on such a question that is the most valuable evidence. We have it, too, at a time when, if ever, it might be supposed that the change might be well grounded.*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.7*

Of Omri king of Israel the Bible record is that he "did worse than all that were before him." Ahab was Omri's son, and of him the inspired record is that, "Ahab the son of Omri did evil in the sight of the Lord above all that were before him." *1 Kings 16:25, 30.* Ahab it was who married Jezebel, consented to Naboth's death on the evidence of false witnesses, and persecuted Elijah and his kind. Yet at this very period the kings of Israel were so much better than other kings, that among the surrounding nations they were famed for their mercy. And here is the proof: On a certain occasion, "Ben-hadad king of Syria was defeated by the army of Israel under Ahab. He lost nearly all his army and was himself about to be captured. "And his servants said unto him, Behold now, we have heard that the kings of the house of Israel are merciful kings; let us, I pray thee, put sackcloth on our loins, and ropes upon our heads, and go out to the king of Israel; peradventure he will save thy life." *1 Kings 20:31.**SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.8*

This one point is sufficient to silence forever this charge of cruelty. The evidence is unimpeachable, and proves that the most wicked and cruel kings that Israel ever had were so much better than their contemporaries of surrounding nations that they were famed for being merciful kings. The truth is that the people of Israel from the day that they left Egypt, instead of being the worst, were the best people of all ancient times.*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.9*

"But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."*2 Peter 3:18.* This is often incorrectly quoted, "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of the truth," an expression which is not found in the Bible. But Christ is the truth, as well as the way and the life; and he who grows in the knowledge of Christ, must necessarily grow in the knowledge of the truth. The trouble with many is that they think that growing in the knowledge of Christ, will be accepted as a substitute for growing in the knowledge of the truth; or, rather, professing to believe that Christ is the truth, they make their own feelings the standard of whether or not they know him. The Bible is the only standard of truth, that has ever been given to man, and a summary of all the truth of the Bible is contained in the ten commandments; so that the only standard by which it may be known that we are really growing in the knowledge of Christ, and therefore in knowledge of the truth, is the law of God. The more one grows in the knowledge of Christ, the more perfectly will he keep the commandments of God.*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.10*

"Not According to Law and Order" The Signs of the Times, 13, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

There has been for some time quite a contest in Oakland over the saloon business, and many sharp words have been said on both sides. At an indignation meeting held to protest against the course of some councilmen who had violated their pledges to the people, the Rev. Dr. Horton arraigned the saloons as foes of order and good government, which drew out a response through one of the dailies, from an apologist for the saloons. Following is a part of the defense:-*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.11*

"I will only mention one instance as a reason I respect a man that keeps a brewery, a liquor store, a saloon, a restaurant, or a hotel. Some twenty odd years ago, a brewer came into my place of business and said: 'A certain official is \$500 short in his accounts. To-morrow he will be exposed. He is a good man, as you know, a man of family. Ruin and San Quentin stare him in the face. I have a plan of getting him out of this difficulty. Here are ten names on this piece of paper, and yours is one of them; each of us pay \$50 by to-night.' The \$500 came forth. One of that syndicate, a brewer, one a liquor man, a hotel keeper, six in all were men with foreign names, ideas, and characters. Four were native-born Americans. So was the one saved, and did not belong to their lodge or church, but he belonged to the human family; he was a man worth saving.*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.12*

"Most of that syndicate have passed over the river, whence there is no return. Their lips are closed, never to reveal the secret, and mine have been closed on it that even my own family will first know of it when they read these lines, but never shall I reveal names.*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.13*

"This is part of the religion I believe in. I hope Mr. Horton will read this to his hearers at the next indignation meeting, and give them a chance for a tremendous applause, for that act was not according to law and order."*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.14*

If this is the best defense that could be made for brewers and saloon keepers, thinking people will say that their case is a hard one. Silence would be better than such a defense. It simply shows that they are opposed to law and order; that their sole claim for recognition from the people is that they will combine to save a thief from just punishment. This is exactly in keeping with the nature of the business; it tends only to crime, and to the making of criminals. It is never according to *order*, and is in accordance with *law* only when the law makers, under pressure from the traffic, think to gain a little "revenue" by legalizing sin.*SITI October 27, 1887, page 656.15*

November 3, 1887

"The True Standard" The Signs of the Times, 13, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

The apostle Paul said: "For not he who commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth." ² *Corinthians 10:18*. There are innumerable people who will commend themselves, and a great many who can get others to commend them; but the number who are commended by the Lord is very small. And commendation by the Lord is the only commendation that amounts to anything. Self-commendation is in itself an indication of lack of real worth, for true merit is always accompanied by humility. "If any man think that he knoweth anything, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to know." ¹ *Corinthians 8:2*. Commendation from friends is often liable to be insincere, and even if it is sincere, it represents simply the judgment of those friends, who can know nothing of another's real character. But while man can judge only from outward appearances, God looks upon the heart, and the one whom he commends is blessed indeed. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.1*

The number of whom we have any record that they were approved of God is very small. Of Enoch it is said that "he pleased God." Of Noah it is said: "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generation, and Noah walked with God." The Lord himself bore this witness concerning Job: "There is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil." What a degree of moral excellence must have been attained by Job, to merit such words of commendation from the Lord! The prophet Daniel was told by an angel sent direct from Heaven, "Thou art greatly beloved." Zacharias and Elizabeth, the parents of John the Baptist, are said to have been "both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless." The inspired record says of Stephen that he was "a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost;" the same record says that Barnabas was "a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith." *SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.2*

This is not the complete list of those who are commended in the Bible, yet it comprises the greater portion of such persons. Barnabas and Joseph of Arimathea are the only men to whom the epithet "good" is applied in the Bible, although the same thing is in effect said of the others to whom we have referred. We are inclined to regard these persons as almost a different order of beings from ourselves, and endowed with superior natural gifts; but such is not the case. They were all men of like passions with ourselves, and all the righteousness to which they attained was not due to greater natural endowments, but to their faith. Moreover there is not a person who will ever enter Heaven, of whom the same thing will not be said by the Lord, that is said of these worthies. When the Master returns to reward his servants with an eternal inheritance in his kingdom, he will say to each, "Well done, good and faithful servant." And all may rest assured that this commendation will not be given where it is not deserved. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.3*

What will be the standard by which God will judge of the worthiness of people for this commendation? It will be his own perfect righteousness, for he says: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." And how may we know whether or not we are reaching out and longing for the righteousness of God? How can we know that our aspirations are not for something which would not please God? Are we left to grope in blindness after something far beyond our knowledge, in our attempt to attain to the righteousness of God? Not by any means. No man hath seen God at any time, so that no one can from personal observation judge of his character; but God has given us a law which is the transcript of his character, so that we may know what we must do in order to be approved of God. The righteousness of God is the law of God. See *Isaiah 51:6, 7*. That law is a perfect law, and the man who keeps it will be a perfect man. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.4*

But while no man has seen God, we have on record, for our example, the life of One who kept the law in all its fullness. Christ's life was the law of God personified. His life was a perfect interpretation of the law. Whoever is in any doubt as to whether or not the law of God will sanction a certain action, has only to ascertain whether or not Christ ever did such a thing, or if it would be consistent with his character. Whatever is unlike Christ is contrary to the law of God. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.5*

Christ is the only one who ever lived on earth who never did an act that was contrary to the law of God; and he is the only one through whom others may attain unto like perfection. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth." There is much talk in certain quarters to the effect that we are to look to Christ for instruction, and not to the law. Just as though there were antagonism between Christ and the law! Did not Christ say, "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart"? People who talk about leaving the law and accepting Christ, have very limited ideas of the character and work of Christ. They who leave the law, forsake Christ; and they who are out of Christ are far from the law. And so those who at last stand "without fault" before the throne of God, will be complete in Christ; and although the Lord himself will commend them before the assembled hosts of Heaven and earth, they will never commend themselves,

but will ever say: "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood [not by absolving us from obedience to the law], and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen." *W.SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.6*

"A Question of Principle" The Signs of the Times, 13, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

From Roswell, D. T., we have received the following question:-*SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.7*

"Is the use of tea and coffee forbidden by your church? If so, is it Bible doctrine, or doctrine of man?"*SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.8*

In answer to this we can say that the Seventh-day Adventist Church does not *forbid* the use of tea and coffee, nor does it either *forbid* or *command* any other practice. It has no authority to make commandments and impose restrictions. "There is one lawgiver," and "the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is king." *Isaiah 33:22*. There is none other than God that has authority to give commands. True, the parent may command his child, but only insofar as God has gone before in giving commandment; and in that case he is only in the place of God to the child. But even the parent has no right to issue commandments that originate with himself alone, and which are outside of the commands of God. So we may say truly that the Seventh-day Adventist Church does not forbid stealing, Sabbath-breaking, or murder, although it does not admit to its fellowship anybody who is addicted to any of these sins. The Lord forbids murder, Sabbath-breaking, stealing, etc., and all the church has to do is to conform to his requirements; none who disregard the requirements of God are followers of Christ.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.9*

But that we may not be misunderstood, we will state plainly the status of tea, coffee, and tobacco among Seventh-day Adventist. The use of the two former is discouraged, so that it is very rare in the denomination; but it is not considered a disciplinary offense to use them; but the use of tobacco is regarded as a disciplinary offense; none who use it could be received into the church, any more than one could who is addicted to gambling. The reasons for this will appear in this article. Which will serve to answer several questions that we have received.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.10*

In the first place, why should not the tobacco-user be received in the Christian fellowship? The Bible does not say anything about tobacco; then why should any church presume to say that its use is not consistent with pure Christianity? These questions are often asked concerning tobacco, and still more often concerning tea and coffee; but we prefer to consider tobacco first, in order to bring out a principle. The very same questions might also be asked in regard to whisky. The Bible nowhere says anything about whisky. "But," someone will say, "it does say that drunkards shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven, and that shuts out the habitual user of whisky." Exactly; but while the strict etymology of the word will not allow the word "drunkard" to be applied to one who does not drink, it is a fact that the use of tobacco is fully as injurious and degrading as that of whisky.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.11*

The use of tobacco is also forbidden by the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." There never was a Hindoo devotee who was more of an idolater than is the confirmed tobacco-user; or an African slave who was held in more degrading bondage. When a man will spend more for tobacco than for bread for his family; more for the vile weed by which he makes himself disgusting to all clean people, than he does for the support of the gospel, we affirm that he is an idolater, although he may profess to be a Christian. He allows his pipe or plug to come before God. And we venture this further assertion, that there is not in this whole world a devotee of the weed who does not think more of tobacco than of any other one thing, not excepting his family or his God. If that assertion be true, all will admit that the tobacco-user is an idolater; and we propose to show not only that it is true, but that it cannot by any possibility be otherwise; so that the habitual tobacco-user must necessarily be an idolater, and consequently a sinner in the sight of God.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.12*

One fact alone is sufficient to prove the assertion, and that is that the habitual tobacco-user *cannot* think of anything but tobacco, if he is deprived of it. The caresses of his wife, the prattle of his children, the appeals of the ambassador for Christ, even the demands of his business, or the condition of stocks, all are alike unheeded if he has been deprived of tobacco for twenty-four hours. Not only are they unheeded, but he cannot by any possibility fix his mind upon them, no matter how hard he may try. The longing for his idol, tobacco, crowds out everything from his mind. Let him have his tobacco, and he feels all right. Men think that they do not make an idol of tobacco, because they scarcely ever think of it. When they feel a craving for it, they supply that craving almost mechanically; but the fact that when deprived of it they can think of nothing else, and that they depend upon it as a stimulus to their faculties, shows that it is before everything else; it is the god upon which they depend.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.13*

Is it possible that a man who is bound with such fetters is a Christian? We say, No. He may say, "Lord, Lord," but he is not a Bible Christian. The Christian must seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness; he must hunger and thirst after righteousness; his condition is described in the words of the psalmist: "My soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord; my heart and my flesh crieth out for the living God." *Psalms 84:2*. But the habitual tobacco-user seeks first his tobacco; his flesh cries out for tobacco, above everything else. If he is a professed minister of the gospel, he depends upon his cigar even for the inspiration to make a fervent prayer to write or deliver an elegant sermon; so that even in his professed service for the Lord he depends, not upon the Lord, but upon his tobacco. We say that it is the worst form of idolatry, when tobacco is depended upon to help to do the work of the Lord. And everyone who is addicted to the use of tobacco is held in the same kind of bondage. No man can have the Lord, nor even his family or his business, first in his thoughts, if he uses tobacco. The vile stuff will assert and maintain its claim to have the first place. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 662.14*

Once more. The apostle Paul exhorts us to "cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear God." *2 Corinthians 7:1*. Certainly this includes tobacco; for all the other filthiness of which the flesh is capable cannot outrank the filthiness which comes from tobacco-using. Again we are told of those who expect to see Christ as he is, and be with him when he comes, "every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." *1 John 3:3*. The Christian must be like Christ; but can anyone imagine Christ using tobacco? The very thought is abhorrent, and seems almost blasphemous. But if tobacco-using were not a sin, it would not be difficult to associate it with thoughts of Christ, for sin is the only thing that is foreign to Christ's nature. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.1*

Finally, we have the express injunction: "Whether therefore ye, or drink, or the whatsoever ye do, to all to the glory of God." *1 Corinthians 10:31*. But the man who can tell how smoking or chewing tobacco glorifies God, has never been born. All these things plainly show that the use of tobacco is a sin, and utterly inconsistent with a Christian life, although the weed is never once mentioned in the Bible. The Bible nowhere says that we should draw a man out of a well if he should be so unfortunate as to fall in; but the man who should refuse to perform such an act, would once be set down as no Christian. The Bible does not say that you must help a man out of a well, but it does say that you must do to others as you would have them do to you; and that rule has a broad application. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.2*

But what about tea and coffee? Well, they are not mentioned in the Bible, any more than is tobacco; but everything that has been said about tobacco may be said about them, with the exception of the charge of filthiness. The confirmed tea or coffee drinker is as a veritable slave as the tobacco devotee. How many thousands of women there are who cannot (at least they think they cannot, which is just the same in effect) do anything in the morning until their nerves are toned up by a drink of tea or coffee. They depend upon it as much as the whisky sot does upon his dram. Thousands of men are more morose and fretful, and unable to fix their minds upon their work unless they have their coffee. This is not because the tea or coffee is absolutely essential, any more than the whisky or tobacco, for thousands of other people do the same work, and do it better, without any narcotic war stimulant. Those who depend upon the stimulant would do better work without it, if they would break loose from the habit; but the tea, coffee, tobacco, and whisky create a fictitious want, and the user depends upon the stimulus which they give, instead of upon his own strength, or the help which he should get from God. Now we insist that this is idolatry, no matter what the stimulant. A person cannot at the same time be both bond and free. He who is the slave of appetite cannot be the servant of Christ. When a person cannot even offer an intelligent prayer for help in service or in worship, without first having the stimulus of tea or coffee, we say that the drink, and not God, is the first and even the sole dependence. And as the case of tobacco, so with tea; it demands for itself the first place, and will not allow its slave to perform any work until it has been consulted. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.3*

Again, the statement that drunkards shall not inherit the kingdom of Heaven, shuts out the tea inebriate as well as the whisky sot; for although tea is extolled as "the cup which cheers, but not inebriates," it does have intoxicating properties, and a person may as surely become drunk upon it as upon beer. But it is unnecessary to carry the argument farther. Anyone can see that a practice that is wholly unnecessary, that is enslaving, that demands the expenditure of money that should be given to the cause of God, and that thrusts itself even ahead of God, cannot be a thing that is done to the glory of God. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.4*

The question will then be asked, why the use of tea is even tolerated in the church, when the tobacco-user is excluded. Strictly speaking there is no difference; but we suppose the difference is made partly because the injury caused by tea or coffee is not so great as that caused by tobacco, and that the former are not filthy, as is the latter. It is a sort of concession made to the hardness of people's hearts, as in the case of divorce in the days of Moses. But that the general rule, "Whether therefore ye, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God," would exclude the habitual use of tea and coffee, we do not see how anybody can doubt. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.5*

In this article we have aimed simply to cover general principles. There are many questions that might be

raised, and that are even suggested by this discussion, and there are exceptions, etc., which cannot be considered now. But we are confident that no questioning can shake the principle that we have brought out, and that although a practice may not be specifically mentioned in the Bible, it cannot be considered as consistent with an enlightened Christianity if it usurps the place that should be given to God. W.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.6*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

The President has appointed Thursday, November 24, as a day of general thanksgiving.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.7*

We learn that a Seventh-day Adventist Church of thirty-four members has been organized in the Caucasus, in the southeastern part of Russia, and that about fifty are keeping the Sabbath. Thus the light is spreading. May this little company be a center from which rays of light will go to many others.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.8*

The delegates to the General Conference, who live east of Chicago, will leave that city Saturday night, November 5, and will arrive in Oakland Friday, November 11. The first meeting of the session, will be held Sunday, November 13, at 9 A.M. Further particulars have been sent to the churches in California by circular letter.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.9*

A drug clerk at Wichita, Kan., who pleaded guilty to 2,080 counts charging him with illegal sales of liquor, was fined ten dollars on each count, of \$20,800 in all, besides being sentenced to seventeen years and four months' imprisonment. At that rate it will not take long to cause liquor-sellers to believe that prohibition does prohibit.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.10*

Some time ago several hundred printers in New York struck for higher wages, at the command of the labor union. After having been out of work several weeks, with no prospect of any wages at all, the strike committee has kindly allowed the men to go to work again at the best terms they could make, providing they could get work at all. And yet people tells us that slavery is abolished in this country. Of all classes of laborers, printers ought to be too well informed to allow themselves to be driven to and from work like slaves, at the command of men to whom they are under no obligation whatever.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.11*

The *Golden Gate* has an anonymous correspondent who assumes to know all about Adventism, and who waxes indignant at the way that Adventists use the Bible to expose the Satanic origin of Spiritualism. But through his ignorance of the Bible, he unintentionally tells one truth in the following words: "They deny... that man has no soul or spirit." That is so; whenever Seventh-day Adventists hear anybody claiming that man has no soul or spirit, they deny the statement. They believe in the soul, body, and spirit, because they believe the Bible. See *1 Thessalonians 5:23*.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.12*

It is with pain that the *Congregationalist* notices an increasing tendency to disregard the sanctity of Sunday. It cites "for example" an account of "a great train load of the Grand Army which drew out of one of the Chicago stations on a Sunday morning, on its way to St. Louis;" and then says:-*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.13*

"Doubtless there was a considerable sprinkling of church members among these Sunday travelers, whose consciences were not quite at ease over what they were doing."*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.14*

Yes "doubtless" that is so. Therefore, by all means let the civil authority of the nation come to the rescue, and entirely ease the consciences of these Sunday Christians by the enforcement of a rigid, uncompromising Sunday law, that shall compel these church members to do, as church members, what they have not conscience enough to do otherwise. Only let the civil law supply the place of conscience in all these people, then they will all serve the Lord.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.15*

The devil's agents are doing missionary work a thousand-fold faster than are the ambassadors for Christ. As an instance we cite the statement that 1,500,000 copies of "Peek's Bad Boy" have been sold. The *American* only feebly represents the case when it says: "What Canada thistles are to agriculture, this class of literature is to moral improvement." And this book is only one of thousands that have an immense sale, all of which are nauseous with the fumes of the bottomless pit. We often hear of missionary societies that are in debt, but the devil's missionary society always has funds on hand, for it can dispose of all its literature at full price. No matter how dull the times are, the devil's work goes on without diminution.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.16*

The editor of the *Christian Church News* (Oakland) quotes from the report of our camp-meeting the statement of the Sabbath-school secretary that "sixty-one Sabbath-schools and two Sunday-schools are now in active

operation in California," and says:-*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.17*

"This language would puzzle nine-tenths of the people throughout this country, but they are right in not calling a school a *Sabbath-school*, in the Bible sense of the word Sabbath."*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.18*

Quite true; but now a question arises. The "Disciples" profess to make the Bible the standard of their faith and practice, and to use Bible language. Now since "in the Bible sense of the word Sabbath" a "Sabbath-school" can be held on no other day than the seventh day of the week, -Saturday, -then they must admit that that day is the Sabbath, according to the Bible; and, if so, why do they not call it so? If they are consistent, they must call it the Sabbath, and then consistency would demand that they should keep it as such.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.19*

The following question was lately asked the *Christian Union*:-*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.20*

"What explanation can be made of the biblical statements in the fourth commandment and elsewhere, that God *rested* from the work of creation on the seventh day, as viewed in the light of the revelations of his works made by science?"*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.21*

And it was answered thus:-*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.22*

"The phrase 'God rested' is to be interpreted in the light of the usage of oriental literature, in which poetry, law, and philosophy were all intermingled. It is a poetic figure, to be interpreted, if at all, as indicating that the work of creation was ended, *and the work of redemption*, fit for the Lord's rest day, *began*."*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.23*

That is to say that the work of redemption was begun before there was any sin, and consequently before there was anybody to be redeemed! And this idea we suppose is to be interpreted in the light of the usage of occidental religious literature, in which science, theology, and nonsense are all intermingled.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.24*

In the *Congregationalist* of October 20, Professor Pratt, of Hartford Theological Seminary, has an excellent article on "The Selection of Hymn Tunes," from which we clip the following:-*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.25*

"I think that there ought to be enough likeness between the musical worship of the Sunday-school and that of the church, to engage heartily and intelligently in the latter. Nowhere in the church establishment is there room for the use of foolish tunes, for adapted street melodies, for anything that ministers to a frivolous or rollicking mood. Untold injury has been done in many churches by the use of such tunes, not only to sacred music, but to music in general."*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.26*

But exactly the opposite sentiment seems to be the prevailing one nowadays. The Sunday-schools and the Sabbath-schools and the churches seem to have accepted the idea that "the devil has the best tunes," and have adopted tunes which, whether rightfully or not, have the devil's mark upon them; and instead of taking them out of the devil's hands, they have simply educated both young and old to love the devil's music in preference to purely sacred music.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.27*

Now we don't believe a word of the statement that "the devil has the best tunes." He has the best tunes for his purpose, but not for the Lord's work. Satan could not use the tunes which are charged full of reverent devotion, such as Old Hundred, Rock of Ages, Coronation, Ortonville, Ames, Dundee, Day, Boylston, Dennis, and scores of similar ones. These wouldn't serve the devil's purpose at all. They don't have the jingle that he wants; there is worship in them.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.28*

It is true that the hand-organ tunes that have become so popular as "Gospel" hymns, take with the people, and awaken a great deal of enthusiasm. But the enthusiasm is of the same nature as that inspired by a lively waltz, and is not real religious fervor. It is that sort of good feeling that characterizes the members of the Salvation Army, and which the devil would fain have men believe is religious. We know that the sentiment of the age is against the standard music by which people may worship the Lord; but we think that in the matter of music, as well as in other things, it would be far better to educate the people, both young and old, to an appreciation of that which is sacred, than to pander to their natural fancy.*SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.29*

The Pope, last spring, sent Mgr. Ruffo to England on a mission. Mgr. Ruffo made such good use of his opportunities, and was so well received there, that on his return to Rome he reported that the prospect was very good for the complete restoration of diplomatic relations between the Papacy and the throne of Great Britain. At this the Pope was highly pleased. But now he is very much displeased, and he makes "no secret of his displeasure." The reason of this is that Mgr. Persico, who was sent to Ireland at the same time that Ruffo was sent to England, has returned with nothing definite accomplished. The dispatch says that "the Pope

hoped that a favorable result of Persico's mission would have contributed much toward rendering easy negotiations for the renewal of diplomatic intercourse with England." Persico did nothing of the kind, and so the Pope is "much displeased." Well, well, the infallible, the Pope, has his ups and downs, as well as all of us common folks. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.30*

The Sunday-law movement has received a new impetus, especially in New York and Pennsylvania. The liquor traffic, under the title of the Personal Liberty League, has made a strike in the political field to secure a law under which saloons may be kept open from 2 o'clock P.M. till midnight on Sunday. This of course has stirred up the Sunday-law advocates-Protestants of all denominations heartily joining with Catholics-to renewed efforts and louder demands for the protection of the Sunday. If we did not understand the secret of the whole Sunday-law movement, it would seem to us very singular indeed that there should be such unanimous and hearty co-operation in favor of Sunday prohibition and yet such diffident and divided efforts in behalf of prohibition absolute. There is no use in trying to deny it, there are thousands of professed religionists who care little or nothing for the cause of prohibition except on Sunday. They use the Sunday prohibition as a sort of "high-license" dodge, virtually saying to the liquor traffic, "You let us have Sunday free from liquor-selling, and we will say nothing about it during the rest of the week." *SITI November 3, 1887, page 663.31*

"Judgment and Mercy" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary.
(November 20.-Matthew 11:20-30.)

"Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not: Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you." *Verses 20-22. SITI November 3, 1887, page 666.1*

Before passing to the main subject, we may note that we have no record of any miracles that were performed in Chorazin, nor is there in the Bible any other reference to that place, except in the parallel passage in Luke. The Scripture is silent concerning those "mighty works" that were done there, and but for this incidental allusion, we would not know that any such place ever existed. This is one of the things that proves that the gospels are not fictitious tales. A writer of fiction would have referred only to Capernaum, or to some other place already mentioned as the scene of mighty miracles; he would not have brought in Chorazin without first recording some miracles wrought there. But Matthew writes as one who deals with things of common report, and that were not done in a corner. *SITI November 3, 1887, page 666.2*

The question has sometimes been raised, "If Tyre and Sidon would have repented, if the works done in Bethsaida had been done in them, why were the works not done, and they thus given a chance to repent?" Dean Alford answers this question thus: "Because every act of God for the rescue of a sinner from his doom is purely and entirely of free and undeserved grace, and the proportion of such means of escape dealt out to men is ruled by the counsel of his will who is holy, just, and true, and willeth not the death of the sinner, but whose ways are past our finding out." But there seems to be an answer that is more satisfactory. First we must remember that God "is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." *2 Peter 3:9. See also 1 Timothy 2:4; Psalm 103:8; Exodus 34:6; 7. He himself says, "I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live." Ezekiel 33:11. Therefore it may be set down as a fact that God never brings judgments upon people without first giving them sufficient warning, and time for repentance. Whenever the wicked are destroyed, it is their own fault, and not because God has not given them enough chance to repent. See the case of the antediluvians. Genesis 6:3; 1 Peter 3:20. SITI November 3, 1887, page 666.3*

In order fully to understand the matter, we must read also these verses, which immediately follow: "At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight." *Matthew 11:25, 26. Here the same principle is involved, but in such a way that the answer is suggested. We are not to understand that Jesus rejoiced because any had failed to receive light and knowledge, but rather because there were some to whom it could be revealed. And we are to understand that "these things" were hid from "the wise and prudent," not because God willed that they should not know them, but because they refused to receive them; and here is the proof:-SITI November 3, 1887, page 666.4*

Paul says, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost; in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." *2 Corinthians 4:3, 4. Here we are told that "these things" are hid only from those*

whose minds Satan has blinded; but Satan cannot blind the minds of any who do not willingly yield to him. See *Romans 6:16*. Of the Jews the Lord said: "For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." *Acts 28:27*. See also *2 Thessalonians 2:11, 12*.SITI November 3, 1887, page 666.5

These texts conclusively show that the truths of the gospel are hidden only from those who close their own eyes. When Christ said that "these things" were hid from "the wise and prudent," he referred to those who were wise in their own conceit, and not to the truly wise. Of the heathen we are told that "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." *Romans 1:22*. They were so wise in their own estimation that they did not like to retain God in their knowledge; they felt, like modern Spiritualists, that their reason was fettered so long as they held to "the God-idea;" and so they were left to a mind void of judgment, to do all manner of iniquity.SITI November 3, 1887, page 666.6

The "wise and prudent" are the worldly wise, of whom Paul said: "For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called; but God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty." *1 Corinthians 1:21-27*.SITI November 3, 1887, page 667.1

It is very common to hear people speak of men who "know so much that nobody can teach them anything." It is not meant that the men are really wiser than anybody else in the world, but that they think themselves so very wise that they will not receive instruction from anybody. So with the "wise and prudent" ones of this world. They imagine themselves to be so wise that they need not listen to the teaching of Christ, and so the glorious light of the gospel is hid from their eyes. But one who doesn't think he knows it all already may be taught. So David says: "Good and upright is the Lord; therefore will he teach sinners in the way. The meek will he guide in judgment; and the meek will he teach his way." "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him; and he will show them his covenant." *Psalms 25:8, 9, 14*. The man who nurses his pride, shuts himself off from receiving the light which if received would guide him to life.SITI November 3, 1887, page 667.2

Thus it was with the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon, and with Sodom. If the mighty works that were done in Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum had been done in them, they would have repented; but the mighty works could not be done in them. They themselves made it impossible for the mighty works to be done, because in their wicked pride they would not receive even the first principles of truth. It was just so in Nazareth, of which place it is said: "And he did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief." *Matthew 13:58*. Nazareth was proverbial for its wickedness (*John 1:46*), and as soon as Jesus began to teach there, the people rejected his words. See *Matthew 13:53-58*; *Luke 4:16-20*. Before Jesus left them, however, he emphasized the point which we have noted, namely, that unbelief and hardness of heart will shut out the help that God is willing to give, by referring to the cases of the widow of Sarepta and Naaman the Syrian. There were many others as needy as these two, but they were not as willing to receive help. In the city of Sodom everybody was saturated with wickedness. They were wholly abandoned to their own depraved lust, and therefore they were so hardened that the moment the message came to them from God, they mocked and tried to kill the messenger. If their hearts had been submissive enough to listen quietly to truth, mighty works might have been done, and many might have been converted, and the city thereby saved from destruction. But the works were not done, because they would not allow them to be done.SITI November 3, 1887, page 667.3

The Saviour closed his discourse with the following most beautiful and tender appeal: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light."SITI November 3, 1887, page 667.4

There are two yokes and two burdens. The burden of sin is indeed heavy; if it is not lost at the foot of the cross, it will sink the bearer into perdition. To all who are heavily laden with sin, Jesus says, "Come unto me, ... and I will give you rest." There is no doubt about this. If they come, he says, "Ye shall find rest unto your souls." Then why not go? Why carry a heavy burden, when somebody freely offers to carry it for you? In exchange he will give his own burden, which is light. The "yoke of bondage" is a galling yoke. From this Christ will set all free who will come to him, and he says, "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." *John 8:36*.SITI November 3, 1887, page 667.5

A yoke implies service. Those who are entangled in the "yoke of bondage," are the servants of sin; they carry

the heavy load. Christ's yoke is easy, but the fact that those who come to him must take his yoke upon them, shows that those who come to Christ must engage in his service. They must be workers. But Christ's service is not slavery. It is a pleasure to work when the yoke fits the neck. None can be followers of Christ unless they learn of him to do his work. The earlier one becomes used to work, the more efficient will he be; so the prophet says: "It is good for a man that he bear the yoke in his youth." *Lamentations 3:27. W.SIT! November 3, 1887, page 667.6*

November 10, 1887

"Is There any Excuse?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

"If the sin of ignorance is a sufficient excuse for Christians when endeavoring to live up to the gospel light, why not a sufficient excuse for the heathen who have not the light, and never did have? a fact which is easily proved in many instances. "G. I. H." *SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.1*

Our correspondent doubtless meant to say, "If ignorance is a sufficient excuse for sin," etc., instead of, "If the sin of ignorance is a sufficient excuse;" for certainly no sin could excuse itself. But in either case, our answer would be this:-*SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.2*

1. There is no excuse for any sin whatever. Sin is inexcusable in any person; and there is no authority for saying that God will excuse any sin in anybody. True, Paul says of his career as a persecutor, "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief" (*1 Timothy 1:13*), but this shows that Paul was not excused for his sin which he committed in his ignorance. If he had not repented, he would not have found mercy. His sin of ignorance had to be pardoned. He says further: "And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus." *Verse 14*. If it had not been for the exceeding abundance of the grace of God, through faith in Christ Jesus, his sin of ignorance would have caused his ruin.*SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.3*

2. Again, the following provision for the people in ancient times, shows that sins of ignorance are not excused, but that they must be atoned for:-*SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.4*

"And if ye have erred, and not observed all these commandments, which the Lord hath spoken unto Moses, even all that the Lord hath commanded you by the hand of Moses, from the day that the Lord commanded Moses, and henceforward among your generations; then it shall be, if ought be committed by ignorance without the knowledge of the congregation, that all the congregation shall offer one young bullock for a burnt offering, for a sweet savour unto the Lord, with his meat offering, and his drink offering, according to the manner, and one kid of the goats for a sin offering. And the priest shall make an atonement for all the congregation of the children of Israel, and it shall be forgiven them; for it is ignorance; and they shall bring their offering, a sacrifice made by fire unto the Lord, and their sin offering before the Lord, for their ignorance; and it shall be forgiven all the congregation of the children of Israel, and the stranger that sojourneth among them; seeing all the people were in ignorance." *Numbers 15:22-26. SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.5*

3. In *Psalms 19:12, 13* we read the following words: "Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me; then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression." This is part of a prayer which David offered to God. This brings to view a case different from that supposed in *Numbers 15:22-26*. There the people were directed to offer sacrifices indicative of repentance, when the sin committed in ignorance came to their knowledge; but David's prayer is for cleansing from sins of which he was ignorant at the time. He knew that he must have committed sins of which he was not aware, and he recognized the fact that they were sins, and that he needed forgiveness for them as well as for those sins of which he was conscious. These instances show clearly that God does not excuse sin. Every sin whether known or unknown must be atoned for by the blood of Christ; there is no other way by which anybody can be freed from its guilt.*SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.6*

4. The above conclusion does not militate against the statement that men are judged according to the light that they have received. No man will be condemned for not doing what he did not know, and had no means of knowing, was commanded. Both are judged by the light which they have received. If they have conscientiously lived up to that, it will be well with them, for their secret sins will be forgiven. But it is claimed that the heathen have no light at all. This is a mistake, as will be seen from certain scriptures which we shall quote.*SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.7*

In *Romans 1:18-20* we read: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." From this we learn that there are no people who may not know that there is one God, of infinite power and goodness; that "he giveth to all life and breath and all things;" and that for this reason they ought to worship him. And from *Acts 17:27*, and context, we learn that if men would thus recognize the power of God, and seek to know more of him, they would find him, because he is not far from every one of us. See also *Romans 10:6-8*. The righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith.*SITI*

Again, in the second chapter of Romans, Paul shows exactly by what every man is judged, and condemned or justified. He speaks of those who have the revealed word of God, and of those who have it not, saying: "For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law;" "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." *Verses 11, 12, 16.* *SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.9*

But lest someone should question the impartiality of this, and should ask how men who have not the written word of God, could be justly condemned, the apostle throws in an explanation in *verses 13-15*, as follows: "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another." *SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.10*

The meaning of the passage is simply this: There is nobody who does not know the difference between right and wrong, to some extent. The heathen who have never heard of the Bible or the gospel, know that there are some things that they ought not to do. This is shown by the fact, to which Paul refers, that their consciences condemn or approve, according as they have done ill or well, and they also accuse or else excuse one another for their deeds. Now if the heathen have a little knowledge of right and wrong, no matter how little it may be, and do not live up to even that little, it is manifest that justice demands that they should be condemned, just the same as it demands the condemnation of the man who had greater light but has not lived up to it. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.11*

But what if the heathen should live up to all the light that he has by nature? Then he certainly cannot be condemned. The one who lives up to all the light that he has, will receive more light, as did Abraham, who feared God, although he had been surrounded by heathen from his infancy; and because he lived up to that light which he had, God revealed himself to him in a more marked manner. And as with the Christian, so with the heathen who does every duty of which he has any knowledge; his sins of ignorance will be forgiven. But it must be evident that sins of ignorance do not figure in the case at all, so long as a person is sinning against light, no matter how small that light may be. That is to say, it is not necessary to bring the whole law against a man who knows but part of the law, when he does not live out that part. The part that he knows and does not perform is sufficient to condemn him. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.12*

The idea suggested by the question of our brother, namely, that many of the heathen "have not had a fair chance," is becoming quite popular. The inevitable result of entertaining it is either to impeach the justice of God, or else to claim that another probation will be provided for those heathen. And from this the transition is easy, and many people are making it, that for people in so-called Christian lands there will be another probation; and this speedily runs into universalism. But there is no excuse for any of these errors; God is just; he is "no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him;" and he gives to every man that comes into the world sufficient knowledge to enable him to fear God and keep his commandments. *W. SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.13*

"The Testimony of the Dying" The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

The so-called testimony of the dying is one of the strongholds into which the advocates of no actual death for man retreat, when they have been driven from every position which they have taken from the Bible. When it is demonstrated that the Scriptures teach that man does really die and go to the grave, and that the moment he dies he loses all consciousness and power of thinking, and that until the resurrection he remains in the grave, where there is "no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom," they will cite instances where the dying have declared that they saw Jesus, or the angels, or even some of their friends who were already dead, and who were coming to welcome them, and have said that they were going directly to Heaven; and then the question will be asked, "Can't you accept the testimony of the dying? Do you think that a dying man would tell a lie about where he is going?" This appeal, made in such confidence, and in a pathetic told, very often satisfies people that the dead are conscious, and that they go to Heaven immediately upon their death, even when these same people know that the Bible emphatically contradicts such ideas. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.14*

We wish to examine this testimony, and see just how much weight it is entitled to. In the first place, we must rule out all the cases in which the dying person is or has been delirious, for certainly no one would wish to base any theory upon the statement of a person not in his right mind. But allowing that there has been no

delirium, we must even then take the ecstatic ejaculations of the dying with a great deal of allowance, although the veracity of the individuals may be beyond question. The reason is, that although the mind may not wander, it is from the very nature of the case weakened. It is exceedingly rare, perhaps impossible, at the close of an illness which is about to result in death, when all the physical organs are relaxed, that the mind should retain its full vigor and clearness. It is often said of people that they retain all their senses to the last, and this is undoubtedly true, but that they retain their mental faculties to their fullest extent, is impossible. And so many of the broken statements of the dying as to what they see and hear, may be set down as a result of hallucinations. Proof of this may be found in the cases of those who have been nearly dead from drowning or freezing, or from some other cause, and who have recovered. Such ones relate the happy sights which they saw, and the blissful sounds which they heard, and state that to be called away from them to real consciousness seemed a rude awakening. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.15*

There is no reasonable doubt, therefore, but that ninety-nine one-hundredths of the cases in which the dying are said to have seen and heard wonderful things must be ruled out altogether from the so-called testimony of the dying. And even the other one-hundredth is very doubtful testimony, since in no case can it be *known* that anything has actually been seen. We will proceed on the supposition, however, that there are some cases in which certain forms are actually presented to the dying person, and will consider in their order the cases where the dying person has said that he was going immediately to Heaven, and were Jesus and angels, or the forms of dead friends, are said to have been seen. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 678.16*

But first and continually let it be remembered that the testimony of the Bible is emphatic upon the point that the dead know not anything; that they are sleeping a dreamless sleep, from which they can be awakened only by the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God at the last days; that their thoughts perish as soon as their breath leaves the body; and that none can go to Heaven until Christ comes for them in the glory of his Father, with his angels. If this is constantly borne in mind, then no one who believes the Bible can be moved in the least by the testimony of anybody, whether dying or in the full possession of all his powers. The Bible must be the decisive standard of appeal and all cases. If we give up the plain declarations of the Bible for the statements of individuals, then the Bible is no longer to us a sacred book, and we virtually deny its inspiration. Let the word of God be held as true, even though every man is thereby proved a liar. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 679.1*

Now who are they who say upon their death-beds that they are going at once to Heaven? Why, it is those who all their life-time have been taught that men go to Heaven as soon as they die. Nobody ever heard of such a thing as that a believer in eternal life only through Christ, to be received at the resurrection of the just, has upon his death-bed seen visions of angels coming for him to take away to Heaven. But why not? It will not be denied, even by the most earnest advocate of the natural immortality of man, that many very good men have held to the doctrine of conditional immortality. Then if the angels do come for the dying, whose eyes and ears are often unable to catch their forms and voices, why are not such visions granted to the believers in conditional immortality? The question suggests the answer, which we have already given, that such visions are hallucinations, which naturally follow the bent of the person's mind. And so the statement of a dying man, to the effect that he is at once going to Heaven, is of no more value than the statement that the righteous go to Heaven at death, made by the same man in health. The fact that a man is dying, does not add one whit to the force of the statement that he may make concerning the future. He will say just what he has been taught to believe, and we must go to the Bible to find out whether or not the statement is true. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 679.2*

In the adherence of the so-called testimony of the dying, in spite of the testimony of the Bible, the thoughtful person will see the leaven of Spiritualism working. Spiritualists ignore the Bible, for the testimony of those who claim to be the spirits of the dead. But this is in reality but little different from taking the statement of the living, in contradiction of the Bible. When people base their belief as to the condition of man after death, upon what a dying man says, notwithstanding the fact that the dying man's statement contradicts the Bible, it will not be long before they will accept the testimony that is given by what appears to be the same person after his death, and which tells them that the Bible itself is but a fable. In short, when one sets aside the testimony of the Bible for any cause whatever he is on the high road to Spiritualism, with all that implies. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 679.3*

We have, indeed, the record of one man who shortly before his death saw Heaven opened and the Saviour standing at the right hand of God. But the case of Stephen is entirely different from that of a dying man that is brought forward, because, (1) Stephen was not a dying man when he saw this. It was his statement of what he saw that caused the Jews to stone him to death immediately. (2) Stephen did not say that he was going to Heaven or anything of the kind. He had been arraigned before the Sanhedrim for preaching Christ, and this vision of heavenly things was to vindicate the truth of his words, to confound the opposition, and to give him courage for the ordeal just before him; and (3) the record says that after Stephen had had this view of heavenly things, he was stoned by the Jews and "fell asleep." He did not enter at once upon the enjoyment of those heavenly scenes, but the vision faded from his view as he fell asleep and lost all consciousness of

things either earthly or heavenly. As with Paul, so with Stephen, the crown of life was laid up for him, to be given at the appearing and kingdom of Jesus Christ. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 679.4*

It need not be concluded that no good person ever has visions of heaven; that no one has, like Stephen, a view of heavenly realities to strengthen him in the power of death. But that is no evidence that the one who sees such things is going at once to enjoy them. "But," says one, "what a disappointment it would be to the good soul who has been taught that he will go to Heaven at death, if he should see heavenly things, as Stephen did, and should not go at once to enjoy them!" Not at all. How can there be any disappointment when there is unconsciousness? When the approach of death causes the scene to fade from the sight, and the person sinks into the unconscious repose of death, it is the same to him as though he had seen nothing. There is no disappointment, for there is no knowledge. The time spent in the tomb, whether it be days or centuries, is to the unconscious sleeper as no time at all, and if his last conscious moment was brightened by a view of Heaven, the first moments after his awakening will usher him into the reality; so that there is no chance for disappointment though centuries may have intervened between his death and the resurrection. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 679.5*

There remains only for our consideration the case of those who, when dying, say that they see their friends who have died before, and that they beckon them to come. Of course much, and perhaps all, of this may be set down to hallucinations. When people have been taught to believe that the dead are conscious and in Heaven, and have thought much of meeting them in death it is very natural that the hallucinations of their weakened minds should take such a form. But we will allow, although it can never be proved, that there are cases in which the dying do actually see what appear to be their friends to have died before them; and the question will arise, "How do you dispose of such testimony?" We reply that we dispose of it just as we would dispose of similar testimony given by any person in full health. We know that many persons have attended Spiritualist séances, and have seen what appeared to be the forms of their dead friends, and that they have received from them messages. Now what do we conclude in such a case? Simply that the spirits of devils have assumed the appearance of those dead friends in order to strengthen the living in their belief in the inherit immortality of the soul, and to weaken their faith in the plain testimony of the Bible. And if such forms should appear to the dying outside of a Spiritualist séance, we should say the same thing, for we know both from reason and revelation that it is impossible for dead people to move or talk or think. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 679.6*

It will be objected that Satan could have no object in thus deceiving those who are at the point of death, and that if he had an object, it would be cruel for the Lord to allow either the dying or the living to be so deceived. To this double objection we reply: (1) Since Satan is a deceiver, and his whole aim is to cause men to disbelieve the word of God, it would be the most natural thing for him to take advantage of the erroneous opinions of the dying, to confirm the living in the same erroneous opinions. (2) As to the justice of God in allowing such deceptions to take place, we have only to say that God is in nowise responsible for them, for he has given sufficient warning against them. In the Bible he has again and again warned men against such deceptions, and has given us the truth by which we may detect error. Now if men neglect or despise the warning which God has given men, who dare lay it to the charge of God if they are deceived? They need not be deceived if they heed the words of God. But if they choose to listen to their own imaginations, or to heathen speculations, or to any statement that contradicts the word of God, they invite deception, and have only themselves to blame if that deception results in their ruin. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 679.7*

It is possible, of course, that certain ones may have, just as they are about to die, a vision of the resurrection, and, if so, this would account for their seeing their friends who had died before them, and who would appear in the first resurrection. But this would not, of course, add anything to the claim that the good go to Heaven at death. Whether those who might have such a vision, would understand that it represented the resurrection, or would think that their friends have actually come from glory to meet them, would make no difference with the fact. Even though, if such a vision were given, the one who had it should declare that his friends were coming from heaven to meet him, that would not make it so. The Bible furnishes all the knowledge that we have or can have on the state of the dead, and its evidence is unequivocal. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 679.8*

The object of this article is to emphasize the words of the prophet: "And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter; should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isaiah 8:19, 20.* Remember that God's word is true, and that outside of that there is no truth, and that conscientiousness on the part of the speaker does not add any force to his words if they are contrary to the teaching of the Bible. *W. SITI November 10, 1887, page 679.9*

"The Sabbath, the Lord's Day" The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

There are those at the present time who tell us that the fourth commandment does not require the observance of the seventh day of the week, but of simply one day in seven, no matter which day of the week. Now this is either so or else it is not so. It is certain that Jesus knew what the commandment requires, and it is also certain that the day on which the disciples passed through the field and ate the grain was the seventh day of the week, familiarly known in the Bible as the Sabbath day, the day which the Jews kept, and do still, in obedience to the fourth commandment. Now if it were true that the fourth commandment does not require that the seventh day of the week be kept, what a good chance there was here for Jesus to tell the Jews so. He could justify his disciples, by informing the criticizing Jews that "in the higher Christian thought, Sabbath observance is listed above the formality of days." But he did nothing of the kind; he recognized that day as *the Sabbath day*, and never on any occasion was there any question between him and the Jews as to the day of the Sabbath. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 682.1*

The only question on this occasion was as to whether or not the disciples had properly kept the Sabbath. Jesus did not set aside the Sabbath, or seek to lower the Sabbath in any way whatever, but he showed them something about Sabbath observance that they had entirely missed. They made the Sabbath a hardship, a thing which God did not design. If they had heeded the words of a great prophet who wrote more than seven hundred years before, they would have regarded the Sabbath as "a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable." *Isaiah 58:13*. But then, if they had heeded the words of Isaiah at all, they would have accepted Christ when he came. And so they would, in fact, if they had really regarded the words that Moses wrote. In those unbelieving Jews was exemplified the fact that may be verified to-day in thousands of instances, that a false idea in regard to the law, and lack of real appreciation of Christ, go together. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 683.1*

Jesus recognized a law for the Sabbath, when he said: "It is lawful [agreeable to law; conformable to law; allowed by law] to do well on the Sabbath day." Now there is only one law concerning the Sabbath, and that is the fourth commandment; therefore we must conclude that to do well on the Sabbath day is conformable to the fourth commandment. And who could think otherwise, since "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and a good"? We are forbidden only to do our own work, but commanded to do the Lord's work, and this presupposes the taking of the food that is necessary for strength. God does not desire any of his creatures to suffer. His law was not given as a yoke of bondage, but just the contrary. It was in love that was given, as Moses said: "The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints; from his right hand went a fiery law for them. Yea, he loved the people; all his saints are in thy hand; and they sat down at thy feet; every one shall receive of thy words." *Deuteronomy 33:2, 3. SITI November 10, 1887, page 683.2*

We are told of the Sabbath, by some commentators, that Jesus came "to own it, to interpret it, to preside over it, and to ennoble it by merging it into the Lord's day." He did indeed own it, as he had a right to, for he made it. We read that "by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." *Colossians 1:16, 17*. Then it was he who created the heavens and the earth in six days, and rested the seventh; it was he who blessed and sanctified the seventh day, so that that day was emphatically his day; and he owned it, saying, "For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." Let no one forget for a moment that Jesus was speaking of the seventh day of the week, the day which is sometimes contemptuously spoken of as the Jewish Sabbath, and that he claimed as his day. Then since the seventh-day Sabbath was the Lord's day; how was it possible to "merge the Sabbath into the Lord's day"? It was such already, and had been such since creation. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 683.3*

But someone will suggest that after the crucifixion the first day of the week became the Lord's day. Query: Will not someone show *proof* that the first day is or ever was the Lord's day, instead of suggesting or asserting? But notice: Jesus here stated a fact concerning the Sabbath. He fully agreed with the Jews as to the day of the Sabbath, and he claimed it as his own day. He differed with the Jews only in the way it should be kept. Now since, when Christ was teaching, the fourth commandment required the observance of the seventh day of the week, it must require it ever since the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, unless some change was made in the wording of it; for it is too evident to need argument that a given set of words cannot mean one thing at one time and another thing at another time. So, then, the seventh day of the week, the day which the Jews ever have observed, although not very strictly in these days, is still the Sabbath, is still the Lord's day. *W. SITI November 10, 1887, page 683.4*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

It is said that more than \$140,000 has already been contributed toward the celebration of the Pope's jubilee mass. What a wicked man the Pope must be, since it requires so much money to obtain pardon for him. *SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.1*

From an article in the *Winsted Press*, extolling Bethlehem, we extract the following, which may be of interest to those who are inclined to think that there is really something good in Buddhism:-*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.2*

"Theosophy, mental science (sometimes called 'Christian science'), esoteric Christianity and Buddhist metaphysics are, we believe, substantially one and the same thing, and we may also include their intimate relative, known here as Modern Spiritualism, the difference between them being no greater than that which invariably arises from different interpretations of the same idea by different individuals under differing environment."*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.3*

Says, the *Congregationalist*:-*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.4*

"We have never liked the separation of the ministry into the two classes of pastors and evangelists."*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.5*

Well now we do like it. And the one grand reason that we do like it is because the Scripture has made the separation. In naming the gifts which Christ gave "for the work of the ministry" Paul says, "He gave some, the apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." Whether the *Congregationalist*, or anybody else, likes it or not, it is right. It is according to the word and work of Christ.*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.6*

A writer in the *Advance* says:-*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.7*

"One of the worst results of the speculative mania seems to be the growing demoralization of the public conscience. Men, high in the church, as well as in respectable society, engage openly and unblushingly in these transactions, till the term 'Christians at work' was not inaptly applied to them by a Jewish dealer. How many young men were there who did not follow the career of Jim Fisk or H. S. Ives with a secret admiration, till startled by their fall? And how much truth is there in the following 'instantaneous photograph' of public sentiment:-*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.8*

"\$1-"Thief!" \$50,000-"Defaulter!" \$100,000-"...!" \$500,000-"Canadian Tourist!" \$1,000,000-"Brilliant Financier!"*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.9*

"Is it an exaggeration to say that we are fast becoming a nation of gamblers?"*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.10*

Yet people will shut their eyes to these facts, and will delude themselves with the idea that the world is growing better.*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.11*

Nearly everybody has heard of the lesson which a priest is said to have given to a woman who was addicted to evil gossip. Giving her a small sack full of feathers, he bade her go along the road and let them out as she went. She did so, and then returned. Then he told her to go over the ground and gather up the feathers; but she found this an impossibility. Some of the feathers had been caught by the wind as soon as they were released, and many of those that had lodged on the ground, had afterward been carried by the wind to other places. This is an apt illustration, and one that ought to have more consideration than it does. It is the easiest thing in the world to start a false report; a person may do it thoughtlessly, with no evil intent, by carelessly repeating a story which he has heard, without waiting to see if it is true. But it is an impossibility to counteract the effect of a false story once started. The one who maliciously invented it, or the one who thoughtlessly spread it, may sorely repent of the evil he has done; the wrong may be confessed, the slander publicly retracted, and each to whom he has told it may be privately visited. This may secure him pardon, but it will not heal the wound made. Somebody will still believe the story or will at least think that there must be some ground for it. There will be some who will not hear the correction, or, hearing it, will be less willing to accept the correction than they were to receive the original story. The wind will have blown the feathers of untruth to some place where they cannot be found. Evil is more easily believed of any man than good. Let a man be charged with being a thief, and though it be demonstrated that the charge is malicious, and without any foundation, yet there will be some who will always look upon the man with suspicion. They will argue that the story would not have been started if there had not been some cause for it. "No smoke without some fire," they will say. True enough; but they forget that the tongue is set on fire of hell, and that it alone is responsible for most of the smoke which blind the eyes of men to the good that it is in their fellow-men.*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.12*

The *Christian World* (London) congratulate the members of the recent Church Congress on their liberality, and the "frank and tolerant spirit" which they manifested. This liberality was indicated by their allowing a Mr. Champion to champion Socialism, and "the Rev. Canon Taylor" to "vindicate the claims of Mohammedanism." It thinks that there can be but little question as to the correctness of Mr. Taylor's observation that "over a large portion of the world, Islam as a missionary religion is more successful than Christianity." Archdeacon

Hamilton, who followed Mr. Taylor, "freely acknowledged that over the inland portions of North Africa Christianity hitherto had not been able to compete with Islam." How many more Church Congresses will convene before Mohammedanism will be recognized as an ally of Christianity? According to the National Reform idea that majorities ought to rule in matters of religion and conscience, Christianity ought to step out of Africa, and leave the field to Mohammedanism. In a world's congress of religions, many countries could be represented only by Mohammedans. Why not by Mohammedans as well as by Roman Catholics?*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.13*

"Arbitration or War?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

Considerable is now being said about settling disputes by arbitration. There is at the present time in this country a deputation from Great Britain, of twelve members of Parliament, for the purpose of working up a treaty between that country and the United States, which shall provide for the settlement of all disputes by arbitration. They were received by President Cleveland, who cordially indorsed their mission and wished them abundant success. He did not, however, feel sanguine that they would succeed in abolishing war at once. But there are others who expect soon to see war as a thing of the past.*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.14*

It is worthy of note that the next column but one to that which gives the account of the arbitration delegation, contains the recommendations of the Board of Engineers, concerning the coast defenses necessary in the United States, and their probable cost. The plan recommended, which will probably be adopted, involves an annual expense of about \$2,000,000, to be apportioned among the principal sea-ports of the United States. This is a very moderate sum, considering the amount expended by other powers. This goes to show that while certain ones may talk enthusiastically over peace, and the settlement of all disputes by arbitration, no nation has any confidence in such talk. The spirit of war is in the air, and every nation on earth is feeling its influence.*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.15*

We do not favor war; we would be glad to see all disputes amicably settled, or, better still, to see no disputes at all; but we have no hope of seeing any such state of things until the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he has destroyed them that corrupt the earth. Wars grow out of the lusts of the human heart, and so long as men's hearts are unchanged, wars will not cease. So long as men show no disposition to settle their private disputes by arbitration, but appeal to the courts, and to the far baser methods, so long may we expect nations to settle their disputes by an appeal to arms. Not only do we see no progress towards peaceful settlements of private difficulties, but we see disputes and quarrels increasing; and we see men fighting for the mere love of fighting, to a degree scarcely equalled in the feudal times when fighting was the sole occupation of men. The Bible says that in the last days man shall be fierce, and fierce men do not settle their disputes by arbitration. The only way to have no fighting is to have no disputes, and that condition of things will exist only in the new earth, where the inhabitants will all be of the same mind.*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.16*

"Entirely Too Familiar" The Signs of the Times, 13, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Advocate* says:-*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.17*

"An ill-constructed school-house in New York City collapses before its completion, burying its builders in its ruins and causing much of death and suffering. The Roman Catholic priest for whose parochial uses it was being erected is among the victims. Blame is laid on the 'building inspector,' by whose connivance or oversight illegal expedients were resorted to which brought about this terrible accident. What is his defense? Simply this: He knew the priest had sufficient political influence to obtain a permit for any constructive irregularities he might choose to indulge in. Whether this be true or not is of less importance than the appalling fact-which none will deny-that such a charge may be brought against a priest without astonishing anyone. Roman Catholics justify the employment of all forces-moral and immoral-for the advancement of 'the church;' and Protestants are so familiar with the intermeddling of Rome with politics that they are no longer shocked by them."*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.18*

Yes, Protestants are becoming entirely too familiar with the intermeddling of Rome with politics. In California one of the foremost preachers of the Methodist Church on the Pacific coast-C. C. Stratton, D. D.-goes on a mission to Archbishop Riordan, to gain the co-operation of the Catholic Church in a matter entirely political. In New York City the leading Protestant divines organize for political work, and propose to ask Archbishop Corrigan to serve on the committee which they appoint, to make their move politically effective. In the same State the fashionable watering-places preachers gathered at Saratoga, get together in a meeting in pass a motion commissioning the National Reform Association to secure if possible a basis of agreement with the

Roman Catholic authorities, by which the public schools of the nation shall be given into the control of the Roman Church where ever the Catholics are in the majority.*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.19*

Yes, indeed, Protestants are becoming decidedly familiar with the intermeddling of Rome with politics. As greedily as these Protestant leaders are of political power, it is evident that they will be apt pupils, and under the tutorship of Archbishop Riordan, Archbishop Corrigan, Cardinal Gibbons, and "Roman Catholic authorities" generally, we may rest perfectly sure that this familiarity will be rapidly and vastly increased. Nor does this familiarity at all seem to breed contempt on the part of these Protestant preacher-politicians; it seems rather to increase their admiration for the "well-favored harlot."*SITI November 10, 1887, page 698.20*

November 17, 1887

"The Sabbath of Antiquity" The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

Under the above heading, Rev. George S. Mott, D.D., has an article in the *New York Observer*, of October 27, which all who are engaged in teaching the claims of the Sabbath would do well to preserve, to show to them who claim that no Sabbath was known until the law was spoken from Sinai. Speaking of the Sabbath law as antedating the formal giving of the Decalogue, Dr. Mott says:—*SITI November 17, 1887, page 682.1*

And so the Sabbath law holds a similar position. It is one of the primal laws. It even antedates marriage. And now a question arises: Was a day of rest recognized in the youth of the human race, while as yet the traditions of Adam were only a few centuries old? The silence in the book of Genesis regarding the observance of the Sabbath, has led to the inference that the day was never held as sacred. But the light thrown upon those early ages by modern discoveries in Assyrian and old Chaldean lore has disclosed the fact that the Sabbath had its place for many centuries after the fall of man. These clay tablets, some of which may be seen in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City, covered with that strange cuneiform character, have been translated. And they tell us of a people called the "Accadians," or "Mountaineers," who came down toward the mouth of the Euphrates. Already they were an organized nation, possessing a peculiar form of writing, and a systematized legislation and religion. These were conquered by Nimrod. They were probably the first people that consolidated themselves into a nation, their writings are not preserved; but on these clay tablets are found extracts from their records and their traditions. And we find that the seventh day, by a tradition handed down from Eden, was holy at that early age, and was honored by a cessation of all work on it. A series of tablets on the creation have been translated, and one of them thus describes the divisions of time:—*SITI November 17, 1887, page 682.2*

"The moon he appointed to rule the night,
And to wander through the night, until the dawn of day.
Every month, without fail, he made holy assembly days.
In the beginning of the month, at the rising of night,
It shot forth its horns to illuminate the heavens.
On the seventh day he appointed a holy day.
And to cease from all business he commanded." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 683.1*

Such was the tradition respecting the Sabbath. But was any respect given to this tradition? Was the Sabbath observed? Here the Assyrian tablets give us most welcome information. Some 2,300 years before Christ, a race inhabited that region who were given to reading and writing. There were large libraries located at different points, and voluminous records were made of all occurrences. These records described with minute particularity the manners and customs, the civil and religious regulations, and the laws of those early ages; and we learn that the seventh day was known and observed as a day of rest. In 1869 the eminent Assyriologist, George Smith, discovered a religious calendar of the Assyrians in which every month is divided into four weeks, and the seventh days, or Sabbaths, are marked as days on which no work should be undertaken. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 683.2*

Other tablets, referring to the Sabbath, have been discovered and translated. On them the day itself has almost the same name as we have received from the Hebrews—it is called *Sabbata*. It is spoken of as a "day of repose of the heart," a "day of joy." Its observance was enforced by law. Regulations as to this observance are laid down. And they are such as these: It was a day "when the shepherd of men must not eat meat; must not change the garments of his body; when white robes are not worn; when sacrifice is not offered; when the king must not go out in a chariot, and must not exercise justice wearing the insignia of his power; when the general must not give any commands for the stationing of his troops." (Lenormant's *Beginnings of History*, pp. 248 and 249, American Edition.) What precisely all these specifications denote we may never learn; but certainly they signify that on this *Sabbatu*, certain things were omitted which could be done on other days. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 683.3*

Now this was the Sabbath law under which Abraham grew up, because Ur of the Chaldees was in this same region. A sad degeneracy from the pure monotheism of the fathers already had shown itself, yet he would hear the seventh day spoken of as a "day of rest for the heart." He was accustomed to weekly assemblies for public worship, to hymns of adoration, and to prayer, although much of this was rendered to idols. Also the Sabbath was an institution in the home of the emigrants at Haran; and when Abraham journeyed on to Canaan, the seventh day was still observed as holy. Under this Sabbath influence Isaac grew up, and so he trained his two boys to observe the day. Jacob continued the same in his large family, and when that family went to Egypt they did not leave the Sabbath in Canaan. It was handed on through following generations. For we find this fact in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, that before the children of Israel came to Sinai, when as

yet they were in the wilderness between Elim and Sinai, the manna was given to them, and respecting it they were told that they must gather on the sixth day so much as would be needed to last through the morrow, because none would be bestowed on the seventh day. And the reason given was, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." This expression is repeated several times, and finally in these words: "The Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." This was no new thing, and when the fourth commandment was formulated the time-honored regulations for the observance of that day were incorporated into it. The people were as familiar with its requirements as they were with those of the other precepts of the decalogue. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 683.4*

And so we conclude that the Sabbath has existed from the beginning. But as the true knowledge of God was displaced by the false, to that degree did the observance of the Sabbath wane, until it finally disappeared in the depths of a degrading idolatry. Yet I believe no Sabbath has come and gone since man was created, but that somewhere precious souls have kept it holy unto the Lord. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 683.5*

"Analogy Not Proof" The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent article, Prof. R. A. Proctor reviews at some length a so-called argument by Dr. Phillips Brooks, on immortality. Mr. Proctor quotes and answers Dr. Brooks as follows: *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.1*

"I have before me a sermon by the Rev. Mr. Brooks, Doctor of Divinity, in Boston, in which he speaks of a man immediately after death. 'That man is dead,' he says; 'what is it that has come? A minute ago I was talking with him; he was speaking to me of the loves and dreams and imaginings with which I have been familiar, as I have known him these forty years. Now that is stopped. Shall I believe that an has come to that vitality? The spiritual life is in the powers of the soul, not in the accident which linked them in association with this body in which the physical change has taken place. Shall I believe that they have ceased because it has ceased to be their minister?' To which he answers: 'No, because what has passed away is merely the bodily life, not the inner life with its thoughts and emotions.' *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.2*

"He does not deem it necessary to show that the power of conceiving thoughts or feeling emotions is not as essentially a quality of that which has been destroyed by death, as the power of making fine cloth is a quality of a weaving-machine, and presumably brought to an end by death as the weaving powers of the machine by its destruction. What he says of the man might equally be said, and with about as much reason, of the machine. 'A minute ago that machine was weaving beautiful cloth; now it has done its last work, and all its parts will presently be applied to other uses. Shall I believe that the powers of working charming patterns it possessed so short a time since are gone because its mere material structure is to be destroyed? Never; for only the merest accident linked those powers with the machinery!' *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.3*

"No answer is needed to one argument any more than to the other. The destroyed machine lives no longer as a piece of mechanism; it can never more produce the delicate textures or the charming patterns which it produced when it existed as a machine. It will live only in its products, direct and indirect. And in like manner, it seems reasonable to believe (though none can say it has been approved) the dead exist no longer as beings capable of feeling or expressing emotions. They live only in their work-in the influences, direct and indirect, which they have produced on those around them during life, or on those who are to come hereafter." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.4*

The Professor's reasoning is correct, not because of the analogy which he draws, but because it is in accordance with reason, and most of all, because, whether he knew it or not, it is in accord with divine revelation. The dead, so far as their present condition is concerned, are perished from the earth. The statement, however, by no means indicates a disbelief in immortality, although it is possible that Professor Proctor may not look beyond the grave. But Paul, who says: "For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished" (*1 Corinthians 15:16-18*), thus teaching that the dead are so far as present existence and capacity are concerned, the same as though they had not been, also says: "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." *1 Corinthians 15:20-22. SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.5*

That which may be drawn from Paul's argument, concerning the state of the dead, is, in brief, this: The resurrection of the dead depends upon the resurrection of Christ; if Christ is not raised, then the dead will not be raised; and in that case those who have fallen asleep (died) in Christ, have perished. To perish means, "To be destroyed; to go to destruction; to pass away; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence." Now it is

evident that the condition of those who died before Christ first at the end, was not changed in the least by his coming and his death and resurrection. Adam and Abel died and returned to dust hundreds of years before the first advent; if that coming of Christ had not taken place until the present time, their condition in the grave would not have been altered in the least; and if Christ had never died and rose again, their condition; would remain the same to all eternity that it is now. But Paul says that in that case they would be perished. Therefore it is evident that the dead are not in existence, and that only the promised future resurrection saves them from being forever perished from the face of the earth. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.6*

That this does not argue a disbelief in immortality is further shown by Paul's words which follow: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." *1 Corinthians 15:51-54*. We believe in immortality, although we do not believe that men have it by nature so that they cannot die. Immortality will be bestowed, according to the Bible, which is our only source of information, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.7*

But the *Interior*, ignoring these plain declarations of the Bible, assume that if men are not conscious in death there can be no immortality, and that he who argues that death is a cessation of existence-in other words, that death is death-denies the possibility of immortality, and proceeds to "prove," by an analogy, that men are conscious in death. It says that the weaving-machine could not have produced the fabric unless there have been some controlling power, a weaver, who was independent of the machine. Then it concludes:-*SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.8*

"Now we are ready to discover whether the analogy makes for, or makes against, the independence of mind for its existence over matter. And as we know to a certainty that mind, which is the prime essential of the weaving machine-without which it would be nothing but formless wood, iron, brass, leather, and fibers of hemp-that the animating and directing mind is not in the least dependent upon the weaving-machine for its existence, so we may know as certainly as we can know from an analogy, that the animating and directing mind is not dependent for its existence upon the human machine. The analogy flatly contradicts Mr. Proctor's theory that the machine produces the mind, and is necessary to its existence." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.9*

That is to say, that because the mind that runs the weaving-machine is independent of it, therefore, the mind must be independent of the body. (It must be so, you see, or else the analogy wouldn't work.) And it still further concludes, that since the man loses none of his skill when his machine is destroyed, therefore the mind loses nothing of its force when the body is destroyed. Very pretty analogy, isn't it? But the analogy should have been carried a little further, and it should have been shown that, even though the man retained his skill after his machine is destroyed, he cannot leave without a machine, so the mind, even allowing that it could exist without the body, can accomplish nothing after the body is destroyed. To be sure this analogy does not teach us anything, but from the Scriptures we learn that it is a correct one, and that the mind cannot act independently of the body, for the psalmist says: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." *Psalms 146:3, 4. SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.10*

Analogies prove nothing, yet they are all that can be adduced in favor of the natural immortality theory. We once heard Joseph Cook deliver one of his famous lectures, the point of which was to prove the immortality of the soul. In the beginning of his lecture he told a story of the war ship *Cumberland*. He said that as she went down under the blows of the *Merrimac*, a sailor who was down in the hold saw a glimmer of light through the open hatchway, and swam up through the water toward that point of light, until he reached the surface and escaped. This he compared to the soul leaving its tenement of clay, and soaring heavenward; and this illustration was the only "proof" of the immortality of the soul that was given in the entire lecture! This incident was often referred to, and because the man escaped from the sinking ship, it was taken as a natural consequence that the soul survives the body, and leaves it at death. And the greater part of the man's audience seemed to think that he had "proved" his point! When even the philosophical Joseph Cook is driven to such ridiculous makeshifts for arguments to prove the inherit immortality of the soul, the thoughtful reader can readily see that the theory itself is inherently weak. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.11*

The fact is, as before stated, that analogies and illustrations prove nothing, not even the truth. When a truth has been demonstrated, then an illustration is valuable for the purpose of impressing the truth already demonstrated, but it is not the proof. Not only can no illustration prove anything, but no illustration can perfectly illustrate any biblical truth. As Dr. Clarke has expressed it, "No parable can go on all-fours." Then how much more feeble must illustrations be when they are used as proof of error. They serve simply, when closely examined, to make the error more apparent. The trouble is that too many persons wish to believe the

pleasing fable that they are by nature immortal, and thus allied to Deity, and therefore an *assertion* to that effect will have more weight with them than scores of plain declarations from the Bible to the contrary. *W.SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.12*

"The Relation of the World to God" The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

The relation which men sustain to God is the thing that above all others should be understood, and which is understood the least. Not only does the world in general fail to understand the matter, and feel perfectly indifferent over it, but many professed Christians, and even teachers of religion, have very crude ideas upon the subject. This thought was brought to mind very forcibly by a sentence in a sermon by Rev. Phillips Brooks, D.D., which was published in the *Christian Union*. It was this: "The world is not under law, but under grace." The context showed that this statement was meant to be taken literally, and not to convey the idea that the grace of God is held out to the world. It is a parallel to the teaching which is so common, about "the Fatherhood of God, and the brotherhood of man." We propose, therefore, as briefly as possible, to show just how the world does stand related to God. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.13*

In the first place, we will say that God is not the Father of all people who are in the world. God is the Creator of all, the Judge of all, and if sin had not entered into the world, he would be the Father of all; but now the mass of mankind have a far baser parentage. Adam was the son of God. *Luke 3:38*. While he was sinless, God was at once his Father and his King. But when he listened to the voice of the tempter, and deliberately (for he was not deceived, *1 Timothy 2:14*) did the bidding of Satan, he yielded to Satan the principality-the earth-which had been intrusted to him, and forsook his allegiance to God. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.14*

It is sin that separates from God. *Isaiah 59:12*. In *John 8:44* Jesus said to the wicked Jews who claimed God for their Father, "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do." Again in the explanation of the parable of the wheat and tares, Jesus said, "The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one." *Matthew 13:38*. In these two texts sinners are directly charged with being the children of the devil. In *Ephesians 2:1-3* the apostle Paul makes the same point, and says that he himself was once a member of the same family. He says: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 694.15*

"By nature the children of wrath." This fact answers the cavil that people often make against the destruction of the wicked, saying that God will not destroy his own children. No, he will not. The wrath of God comes only on the "children of disobedience" (*Ephesians 5:6*), and all are by nature the children of disobedience, and consequently of wrath, since it is in the nature of man to sin,-to obey Satan rather than God. Said Christ: "For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness." *Mark 7:21, 22*. And Paul says: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him." *1 Corinthians 2:14*. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.1*

Then since this is the nature of, not one man or a few men, but of all mankind; since "the whole world lieth in wickedness," and the children of disobedience are the children of wrath, how can any escape the wrath of God, which brings destruction? Simply by becoming the children of God, since God will never destroy his children; for "like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him." *Psalms 103:13*. In the family of God there is no wrath, for only the peace-makers shall be called the children of God. *Matthew 5:9*. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.2*

But that which proves most conclusively that men are not by nature the children of God, is the fact that they become such by adoption. Says Paul: "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." *Galatians 4:4-7*. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.3*

Read the same thing in *Romans 8:14-17*: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we

may be also glorified together." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.4*

Natural children are heirs without adoption; therefore we say that the fact that all who are the children of God become so only by adoption, shows that there are no natural children of God. And how do men become the children of God? By receiving the Spirit of God, which is also the Spirit of Christ, which makes them like Christ, and consequently heirs with him. This Spirit is given through the mercy of God, to those who exercise faith, as Paul says: "But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." *Titus 3:4-7. SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.5*

But what has this to do with deciding whether the world is or is not under the law? It has everything to do with it, settling the question completely, and showing that all men are by nature under the law, and that only the sons of God are under grace. Notice carefully: The Spirit of God is the pledge of our adoption as sons of God (*Romans 8:16*); it is "the Spirit of adoption;" "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." *Verse 14*. With this read *Galatians 5:18*: "But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." The obvious conclusion from this text and the context is that those who are not led by the Spirit are under the law; and since only those who are led by the Spirit are sons of God, it follows that all who are not children of God are under the law. And since the children of God are few in comparison with the children of the wicked one, it follows that the greater part of the world are under the law. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.6*

Now what is meant by "under the law"? Does it mean, as most commonly supposed, subject to the law? in a state of obligation to keep the law? Our investigation concerning the sons of God furnishes the answer. Remember that only those who are not led by the Spirit, who are not children of God, are under the law. Then the children of the wicked one are under the law. Remember also that those who are not led by the Spirit, who are not children of God, are under the law. Then the children of the wicked one are under the law. Remember also that it is only sinners that are the children of Satan; as Paul expresses it, they are "children of disobedience." It is because they are disobedient that they are strangers from God, children of the wicked one, under the law. And this is corroborated by the words of the apostle. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.7*

All men are under obligation to keep the commandments of God. "Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." *Ecclesiastes 12:13*. But all men are not under the law; those who are led by the Spirit are not under the law; therefore we conclude that it is simply the disobedient, -those who do not do their duty, in keeping the commandments, -who are under the law. All others are under grace, since it is only by the grace of God that anybody can keep the commandments. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.8*

Read also *Romans 6:12-16*: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" In this passage we have the fact emphasized that those who are not under the law are the ones over whom sin has no dominion, and that those who are under the law are the servants of sin. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.9*

But sin brings condemnation; those only are free from condemnation, who walk according to the Spirit, -are led by the Spirit, -and who consequently are the sons of God. And the condemnation under which the sinner rests is a condemnation to death; "for the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." *Romans 6:23*. Remember also the idea in *verses 14-16*, that those who are under the law, servants of sin, are servants "of sin unto death." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.10*

Man's relation to God, then, is simply this: By nature all men are sinners, -servants of sin, -children of Satan, -under the law, -condemned to death. By the righteousness of Christ, through faith in the blood, men may be made righteous, -servants of obedience unto righteousness, -children of God, -delivered from the condemnation of the law. Only those who are in Christ attain to this high honor; but this does not free them from obligation to keep the law. This can be seen from the very fact that it is sin that brings condemnation. Now it those who have been freed from condemnation, -have been taken out from under the law, -should transgress the law, they would thereby show their lack of appreciation of the grace of God, and would bring themselves into condemnation, -would bring themselves under the law. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.11*

"For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men." *Titus 2:11*. To all men "the Spirit and the bride say, Come." With every man that enters into the world, the Spirit strives to cause him to renounce

the service of Satan, and to become a child of God. But, alas! with the exception of a few who esteem the reproach of Christ, "the whole world lieth in wickedness." Reader will you place yourself on the Lord's side? If so, you must come to Christ, who is the way (*Psalm 119:1*), the truth (*Psalm 119:142*), and the life, the one in whose heart is the law of God, that you may become changed into the same image, having, like him, the law of God completely formed in your own heart. *W.SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.12*

"The Lord's Prayer" The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

The Commentary

The Sabbath-school lesson for November 26, being on the Lord's Prayer, we know not what better we can do for the Sabbath-school scholars and the general readers than to reprint the following, which we wrote as a comment on the International lessons, when the Lord's Prayer was the subject: *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.13*

Verses 9-13 of Matthew contain the model prayer. In introducing it the Saviour said, "After this manner therefore pray ye." This indicates not that the prayer which follows is to be invariably used, although it is very often fitting to use it, but that it should serve as a model for our petitions. Since it is the model petition, framed by divine wisdom, it must necessarily, and does, cover everything which man needs, both temporal and spiritual. It is because of this comprehensiveness that the Lord's Prayer may be repeated by all of people, both young and old, in all time. It never grows old. It is the only prayer ever written which was worthy of being repeated by others than the one who composed it. This is because it is the only prayer ever composed for man by a divine being. Prayer in which petitions made by men are used, must necessarily be largely mechanical, and therefore destitute of the real essence of prayer, which is the sincere desire of the individual at the present time. When a man is in extremity he will have no difficulty in forming his own petition, and he would have no use for a petition made by someone else. A prayer-book would have been of very little use to Peter when he was sinking in the Sea of Galilee. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.14*

From this prayer we learn that we are to come to God not as to a judge or a governor who is to be appeased, but as to a father who is all sympathy and love. Many people have entertained a wrong idea from the parable of the unjust judge, recorded in *Luke 18:1-7*. The unjust judge at first refused to grant the request of the poor widow, yet he finally granted it because of her importunity. The idea too commonly drawn from this is, that if we persevere in prayer God will relent and answer our petitions; but the parable is not designed to compare God with the unjust judge, but to make a contrast. If the unjust judge who neither feared God nor regarded man, would grant the widow's petition, because of her importunity, then most surely God will avenge his own elect who cry earnestly unto him, this parable and the first two words of the Lord's Prayer are sufficient in themselves to give Christians the most perfect confidence when they pray. Add to this the fact that we have a merciful and faithful High Priest who is touched with the feeling of our infirmities, and "was tempted in all points like this we are," and we may "boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.15*

We have seen it stated that the term "Our Father" implies that all men are brethren, because children of the same Father. But this is a mistake. All men are not children of the same father. Paul says that we are all by nature the children of wrath "because we are" the children of disobedience. *Ephesians 2:2, 3; 5:6*. And as the devil is the author of sin, Christ directly charged the disobedient Jews with whom he was talking, with being the children of the devil (*John 8:44*); and in *Matthew 13:38-42* he expressly states that those who do iniquity "are the children of the wicked one." The apostle John also speaks of those who keep the commandments, and of those who transgress them, and says, "by this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil" (*1 John 3:10*), thus showing a direct contrast between those who have God for their Father, and those whose father is Satan. Moreover, we learn in *Romans 8:14-17* and *Galatians 4:4-7* that people become the children of God by adoption, and that the mark or seal of adoption is the Holy Spirit; but if they were by nature the children of God, they would not need to be adopted. Paul also declares that "if any man have not the Spirit Christ, he is none of his." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.16*

"Thy kingdom come." This is nothing less than a prayer for Christ's second coming, for his coming and kingdom are associated together. *2 Timothy 4:1*. When he was on earth, Christ told his disciples, who thought that his kingdom should immediately appear, that he was like a noble man who "went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return" (*Luke 19:11, 12*), thus indicating his return to Heaven to receive his kingdom, and his second coming to gather the subjects of it. In harmony with this we find in *Daniel 7:13, 14* a prophetic description of Christ appearing before the Father, and receiving "dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." And Christ himself said that when he should come in his glory with all his holy angels with him, then would be the time that he should sit on the

throne of his glory, and that he would then say to the righteous, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." *Matthew 25:31-34*. This kingdom is entirely distinct from the kingdom of grace, upon the throne of which God the Father sits, and before which Christ ministers as priest. *That* kingdom has already come, and if that were the kingdom referred to in the Lord's Prayer, it would be out of place to use that petition. But the kingdom referred to there is the one of which the faithful followers of God are at present only heirs, waiting for the promised possession. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.17*

"Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." The will of God is simply the law of God, see *Psalms 40:8* and *Romans 2:17-20*, where we learn that those who know the will of God are they who are instructed out of the law. How the will of God is done in Heaven is told in *Psalms 103:20*: "Bless the Lord, ye his angels, that excel in strength, that do his commandments, harken unto the voice of his word." When the will of God is done on earth as it is in heaven will be when all the works of the devil had been destroyed, and when the new heavens and the new earth have been given, wherein righteousness shall dwell. Then will be fulfilled the words of the prophet: "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified." *Isaiah 60:21*. Therefore the uttering of this part of the Lord's Prayer, if the petitioner is sincere, indicates a complete submission to the will of God, and an earnest desire to keep every portion of the ten commandments. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.18*

"And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." In this is implied what is plainly stated in *Matthew 6:14, 15*: "For if ye men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if he forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." Therefore it is utterly useless for anyone to use this prayer, or to expect God to pardon his sins, unless he freely forgives all who have trespassed against him. Paul says (*Ephesians 4:32*), "Be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake have forgiven you." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.19*

This is the merest glance at the Lord's Prayer, but it is all that we have space for. To give it any adequate study, not less than an entire lesson should be spent upon each clause of the prayer. But perhaps even with this glance some may see a depth of meaning in the prayer which they have never before realized, and may be led to study it more carefully until they can pray it "with the spirit and with the understanding." *W. SITI November 17, 1887, page 695.20*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

For two or three years it has been the custom of our people to hold a week of prayer near the close of the year. This year it has been appointed for December 17-25. We think that for many reasons this date is preferable to holiday week; but it is probable that the brethren in Europe, Africa, New Zealand, and Australia will find it convenient to hold it between Christmas and New Year's. A large committee appointed by the General Conference is working diligently to prepare a programme, which it is designed shall reach the most distant fields in ample time. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.1*

Here is the suggested item which we clip from a pastor's report to his church paper:-*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.2*

"On Tuesday, August 16, the ladies of the church gave a jubilee social. The lecture-room was crowded, refreshments were abundant, and the spirit of Christian love and fellowship seemed to animate every heart." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.3*

Is it not becoming too common to suppose that the good feeling produced by pleasant company and "abundant refreshments," is the manifestation of "the spirit of Christian love and fellowship"? Even in acts of devotion, religion is getting to be very much a matter of feeling, and many people suppose that when they feel well and happy they are Christians. This is the outgrowth of the teaching that "religion was designed to make people happy." Happiness, in the common acceptance of the term, -that of freedom from care and anxiety, or pain, -may never be the lot of the true Christian; but he will have peace and joy even under the most untoward circumstances. The time for perfect happiness and fullness of joy to the Christian, is when he stands in the presence of God. "In the world," said Christ, "ye shall have tribulation." *SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.4*

The German Empire wastes no time in talking about arbitration, and evidently does not believe in it. In fact, we do not think that there is any nation that believes in it, but there are some that talk it, seemingly as a blind to cover their war preparations. But Germany makes no secret of her war preparations. Only last spring a new magazine rifle was perfected, and the whole German army has been supplied with the new weapon, and has just learned how to use it; and now it must be abandoned, because it is found to be inferior to the rifles in use by the armies of France, Russia, Austria, England, and Holland. The report says:-*SITI November 17, 1887,*

"The chief fault of the German repeater is its too great caliber of eleven millimeters, as against eight in French and most other models. Germany could not accept a small caliber at first, because it is only recently she has succeeded in producing powder of six times the strength of the older description, and in inventing a steel coating for bullets which will prevent the present rapid leadening of the barrel. The chief advantage of the new powder, in connection with the new small caliber bullets, is its superior penetrating effect. The bullets will pierce three horses, one behind the other. They will penetrate steel plates of thirty millimeters in thickness. Whereas the present rifle pierces only five millimeters of steel plate. The German military administration therefore consider it absolutely necessary to introduce improved weapons as soon as possible.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.6*

"The expense will be enormous, as the existing rifles cannot be adapted, as was the case with the magazine rifles. Not only new frames, but also new barrels, will have to be made. The Government hopes to have a rifle superior to the new French one, especially as the caliber will probably be a little less than eight millimeters."*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.7*

Think of a nation being burdened with so great an expense; and just as likely as not, when the new rifle has been distributed, it will be found that the French or the Russians have one still better, so that it in turn will have to be thrown away to make room for another. but the burden upon the people is not taken into account. The nations are in a mad race for supremacy, and each is fearful of being left behind. How long can such a state of affairs last?*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.8*

We believe that all good citizens will agree that nothing but the simple ends of justice have been met, by the execution of the murderous Chicago anarchists. It has been attempted to make it appear that the sentence and execution are a blow against the right of free speech, and a good deal of misplaced sympathy has resulted; but the fact is that they were executed for murder and conspiracy to murder, and not for what they said. Many other people have uttered as treasonable and blood-thirsty sentiments as did these men, and have not been executed, because they did nothing more. It is a terrible thing for a man to be hanged, even by the decree of a court, but it is also a terrible thing for a man to be murdered, without a moment for preparation; and the Bible plainly declares for capital punishment, by saying, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Concerning the widespread sympathy that was manifested in behalf of these convicted men, and that is always expressed to a greater or lesser extent when in the red-handed murderer is condemned to death, we shall have a few words to say next week. It is a notable sign of the times.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.9*

"The General Conference" The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

The twenty-sixth annual session of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists assembled in the church on the corner of Brush and Twelfth Streets, Oakland, Cal., at 9 A.M., November 13. The president, Elder Geo. I. Butler, called the meeting to order, and Elder O. A. Olsen led in prayer.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.10*

That our readers may understand the spread of the work of the Third Angel's Message, we give the following list of delegates and the fields which they represent:-*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.11*

LIST OF DELEGATES

CALIFORNIA-E. J. Waggoner, A. T. Jones, N. C. McClure, C. H. Jones, J. N. Loughborough, M. Church.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.12*

COLORADO-J. D. Pegg.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.13*

DAKOTA-A. D. Olsen.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.14*

IOWA-J. H. Morrison, L. McCoy, L. T. Nicola.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.15*

ILLINOIS-R. M. Kilgore.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.16*

INDIANA-J. W. Covert, J. P. Henderson.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.17*

KANSAS-S. S. Shrock, Oscar Hill, A. G. Miller, J. W. Bagby.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.18*

KENTUCKY-J. H. Cook.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.19*

MICHIGAN-A. R. Henry, U. Smith, W. C. Sisley, E. S. Griggs, C. Eldridge, D. H. Lamson, H. W. Miller. W. Ostrander, J. Fargo, F. E. Belden, J. H. Kellogg.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.20*

MINNESOTA-G. C. Tenney, H. P. Holser.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.21*

MAINE-J. B. Goodrich.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.22*

MISSOURI-D. T. Jones.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.23*

NEW ENGLAND-A. T. Robinson.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.24*

NEW YORK-M. H. Brown.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.25*

NEBRASKA-A. J. Cudney, J. P. Gardiner.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.26*

NORTH PACIFIC-J. Fulton, J. E. Graham.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.27*

OHIO-R. A. Underwood, D. E. Lindsey, Wm. Chinnock, J. F. Robbins.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.28*

PENNSYLVANIA-L. C. Chadwick, J. W. Raymond.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.29*

TEXAS-Henry Hayen.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.30*

TENNESSEE-J. M. Rees.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.31*

UPPER COLUMBIA-H. W. Decker.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.32*

WISCONSIN-A. J. Breek, P. H. Cady.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.33*

The following persons having labored in mission fields, or having been under the employ of the General Conference during the whole or part of the past year, were received as delegates:-*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.34*

SCANDINAVIA-O. A. Olsen.

CENTRAL EUROPE-W. C. White.

AUSTRALIA-J. O. Corliss.

FLORIDA-Samuel Fulton.

HAWAIIAN ISLANDS-A. LaRue.

PACIFIC ISLANDS-J. I. Tay.

BROOKLYN MISSION-J. F. Hansen.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.35*

Elder E. W. Farnsworth was received as a delegate at large, and Elder H. Shultz to represent the German work in America.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.36*

The meeting was occupied in organizing, and in listening to an interesting address by the president, concerning the progress of the work, and outlining the matters to be considered at this session. In the afternoon some very interesting questions were presented, but no final action was reached.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.37*

Next week we shall give our readers all the points of interest in the proceedings of the Conference.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.38*

"Words of Faith and Soberness" The Signs of the Times, 13, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

At the last regular monthly meeting of the Clerical Association (Episcopal) of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, which was held in Oakland last week, the Rev. Mr. Lee read an exhaustive paper on "Church Entertainments," which concluded as follows:-*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.39*

"Doubtless the world and the church would be better off if many an edifice, which has God's name upon it, had never been built, and if many a man who, though speaking in Christ's name, but at the same time living on spurious charity, were forced to work and earn, by the sweat of his brow, what it is a scandal and a shame for him to make use of.*SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.40*

"What is required, it certainly seems to me, is not more comfort or more money, to make religion powerful, but a better use of the means we already have-a more earnest and uncompromising opposition to any union of

the followers of Jesus Christ with the servants of sin, and the thoughtless pleasure-seeker. Of course the church must in one way come into contact with the world, for it otherwise could not carry out its mission; but let it beware how it accepts or employs worldly methods to extend its influence, or to strengthen its existing institutions. Every dollar which it obtains by any enterprise which is unquestionable, must, in the nature of things, tend to its weakness and humiliation. Every surrender to the demands of a mercantile age, and of a careless, pleasure-loving people, will add intensity to the rebuke. 'I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth.' *Revelation 3:15, 16.* *SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.41*

"In view of the prevalence of the practice here in question, and of the frequent occurrence of 'church entertainments' in this diocese, and especially in view of the fact that several have been recently held, and that others are in prospect, it may seem foolish and Quixotic to oppose what has evidently the voice of the majority in its favor; but let us not hesitate, or fear, to look such questions fairly in the face. We should not ask, What is fashionable or common? but, What is right and best for Christian people to do? We should not ask, How can money be more easily collected? but, How would God have us to about the work which he has given us to do? Let us endeavor to view it in this way, and may the merciful Saviour give us grace, so to act as to avoid the open scandal of making his house a 'place of merchandise,' or, worse than that, 'a den of thieves.'" *SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.42*

We commend this to the careful perusal of all who try to carry on church work by any other means than by pure Christian benevolence. In view of the "paper carnival" that has just been held by the members of a church of his own denomination, we think Mr. Lee's paper is very timely. Let no one hereafter accuse us of a lack of charity, when we denounce church fairs, lotteries, carnivals, etc., for by the testimony of one who ought to know, they make the church a "den of thieves." No more severe arraignment could be brought against them. *SITI November 17, 1887, page 704.43*

November 24, 1887

“General Conference Proceedings” *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The General Conference has now (Thursday evening, November 17) been five days in session, and the interest has been steadily increasing. There have been six meetings of the conference, one of the International Sabbath-school Association, one of the Health and Temperance Association, one of the Health Reform Institute Association, and one of the Educational Society. An outline of the work transacted and the measures proposed is here given. After the organization of the Conference, the Norway Conference made a request through Elder O. A. Olsen to be received into the General Conference. There are four churches in Norway, containing 205 members in all, with 40 Sabbath-keepers who are not yet connected with any church. Elder Olson gave an interesting account of the work in Norway. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.1*

On recommendation of Elder Underwood, the West Virginia Conference, with five churches and upwards of 150 members, was received into the Conference. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.2*

The President then made an extended address, outlining the progress of the work during the past year, and suggesting matters for action at this session of the Conference. He stated that the paper in the Dutch language was started in February, in accordance with the vote taken at the last session of the Conference, and has met with remarkable success, having already upwards of 2,000 paying subscribers. Calls for reading matter are coming in from the Dutch in various parts of the world. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.3*

Following the address, the President named the standing committees as follows: *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.4*

Nominations-J. Fargo, J. B. Goodrich, J. Fulton. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.5*

Resolutions-U. Smith, W. C. White, O. A. Olsen. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.6*

Auditing-A. R. Henry, D. T. Jones, H. W. Decker, J. P. Morrison, H. W. Miller, J. W. Raymond *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.7*

Credentials and Licenses-R. A. Underwood, R. M. Kilgore, S. H. Lane. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.8*

Religious Services-J. N. Loughborough, L. McCoy, William Ostrander. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.9*

On motion of Elder Underwood, it was voted that a committee of nine be appointed to consider the week of prayer and holiday gifts, the President to be chairman of the committee. The committee was named as follows: G. I. Butler, W. C. White, O. A. Olsen, R. A. Underwood, C. H. Jones, W. C. Sisley, J. H. Cook, J. C. Corliss, A. J. Cudney. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.10*

It was voted that a committee of five be appointed by the chair, to act with the members of the General Conference Committee, as a committee on distribution of labor. The following persons were appointed: G. C. Tenney, E. S. Griggs, J. M. Rees, A. D. Olsen, Samuel Fulton. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.11*

Meeting then adjourned to the call of the chair. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.12*

At 2:30 P.M. the Conference assembled at the call of the chair. Prayer by Elder R. M. Kilgore. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.13*

The minutes of the preceding meeting were read, and after some minor corrections, were accepted. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.14*

The President then named the following persons as members of a committee to consider the training of canvassers and Bible-workers: G. I. Butler, W. C. White, O. A. Olsen, R. A. Underwood, A. T. Robinson, Clement Eldridge, F. E. Belden, H. W. Miller, H. P. Holser. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.15*

On behalf of the California delegation, Elder A. T. Jones introduced to the Conference the following preamble and resolution, which was passed by the California Conference at its late session: *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.16*

WHEREAS, We believe that the third Angel's message must go to every nation, kindred, tongue, and people; and, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.17*

WHEREAS, The Islands of the Pacific, as well as other parts, demand attention from our people; and, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.18*

WHEREAS, It is difficult to reach them at all by present means of transportation, therefore, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.19*

Resolved, That the brethren of this Conference favor the purchase of a missionary ship adapted to the wants of the work among these islands, and that we request the General Conference to take the matter under consideration in its coming session. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.20*

He then read the following resolution, and moved that it be referred to a committee of five, who should consider it and make recommendation to the Conference:- *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.21*

An Act to Provide for the More Efficient Transportation of Missionaries to the Islands of the Pacific Ocean *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.22*

WHEREAS, The professed faith of Seventh-day Adventists requires them to carry the message of truth for this generation to all *kindreds, tongues, and people*; and as the islands of the Pacific Ocean are people with many thousands who have never heard the tidings of this soon-coming King; and there are no regular means of transportation whereby missionaries may be sent to these islands; and, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.23*

WHEREAS, It is thought by many that the time has fully come in the history of this work when these Islanders should receive that consideration which shall result in an organized effort to carry them the truth for these days; and believing that our people everywhere stand ready to give substantial assistance to every legitimate project for the spread of truth; therefore, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.24*

1. It is recommended by the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists assembled, that a vessel of suitable size and construction for missionary purposes be purchased, or built, and equipped for missionary work among the islands of the Pacific Ocean. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.25*

2. That the cost of building and equipping said vessel for a two years' cruise shall not exceed the sum of twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000). *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.26*

3. That such a vessel be made ready for service early in the year 1888. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.27*

4. That the duly elected officers of this body for the coming year constitute a committee who shall be empowered to put in execution the provisions of this bill, and also to appoint other persons, as their judgment may dictate, to act with them in carrying out the project. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.28*

The motion was carried, and C. H. Jones suggested that as Elder Corliss had given the matter considerable thought, and was well acquainted with the situation, he be asked to address the meeting at length upon the subject. This suggestion was favorably received, and Brother Corliss was requested to occupy the time, when Brother C. Eldridge stated that it is an important matter, and one in which all the people are interested, and suggested that he be asked to speak on it Monday evening, provided it would not interfere with the plans of the Committee on Religious Exercises. This suggestion was carried out, and on Monday evening Elder Corliss spoke to a large congregation, concerning the Pacific islands as a missionary field. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.29*

SECOND DAY

At 9 o'clock A.M. the first meeting of the tenth annual session of the International Sabbath-school Association was held, President C. H. Jones in the chair. The president gave the following interesting statistics of the work of the association:- *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.30*

The first session of this association was held in Battle Creek, Mich., October 11, 1878, Elder S. N. Haskell being president. The number of schools at that time was 177. The number of schools June 30, 1887, was 977, being a gain of 800 schools in less than nine years. The Sabbath-school contributions for 1878 were \$25; the contributions for the year ending June 30, 1887, were \$13,440.61. The number of schools that reported for the quarter ending June 30, 1887, was 915, having 61 unreported. The total membership of the schools reported was 25,294, and the average attendance for the quarter was 17,978, a little over 71 percent of the membership. The number of *Instructors* taken by the schools reported is 11,330. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.31*

The amount of contributions received during the quarter ending September 30, 1886, was \$2,222.22; the amount for the quarter ending December 31, 1886, was \$2,830.61; for the quarter ending March 31, 1887, it

was \$3,710.55; and for the quarter ending June 30, 1887, it was \$4,577.25. Thus there has been a steady increase in this respect. The total contributions for the year ending June 30, 1887, were \$13,440.61. The total amount donated to the African Mission for the first six months of the present year was \$4,708.16. This does not include the large donations taken up at the camp-meetings.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.32*

The following standing committees were appointed by the chair:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.33*

Nominations-R. A. Underwood, M. H. Brown, A. T. Jones.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.34*

Resolutions-E. J. Waggoner, G. C. Tenney, H. P. Holser.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.35*

Lessons-W. C. White, E. W. Farnsworth, A. T. Robinson.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.36*

Auditing-A. R. Henry, W. C. Sisley, C. Eldridge.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.37*

Reports from the various fields were then called for. Elder W. C. White spoke for Central Europe, J. O. Corliss for Australia, S. H. Lane for England, G. C. Tenney for Minnesota, L. C. Chadwick for Pennsylvania, A. T. Robinson for New England, M. H. Brown for New York, A. J. Culney for Nebraska, W. C. Sisley for Michigan, A. J. Breed for Wisconsin, R. A. Underwood for Ohio, J. B. Goodrich for Maine, J. D. Pegg for Colorado, H. W. Decker for Upper Columbia; and all gave encouraging reports of the work of the Sabbath-schools in these places.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.38*

The third meeting of the General Conference was held at 3 o'clock. Additional delegates were received from Indiana, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, Michigan, and California. The following report of the Committee on the Week of Prayer was the presented by J. O. Corliss, the secretary of the committee:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.39*

Your committee recommend that this Conference indorse the action of its Executive Committee in appointing a week of prayer to be held December 17-25, and offer the following suggestions:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.40*

First, That an address be sent to the officers of the churches, Sabbath-schools, and Missionary Societies, setting forth the importance of the week of prayer, and urging them to work for a large attendance at the meeting appointed on fast-day, when they will also have plans to unfold before the brethren, that will secure the co-operation of all the members, so that the following meetings of the week may be a success, and that the Christmas offerings may be liberal. In order to accomplish this, we recommend that the address mentioned shall urge that a special meeting of the officers of the church, Sabbath-school, and Missionary Society be held on Sabbath, December 10, in which they may pray together and consult as to the best method of procedure.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.41*

Second, We also recommend that a circular letter be published in the *Advent Review*, and be read in the churches on December 10, setting forth the objects and importance of the week of prayer.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.42*

Third, We further recommend that articles on the following subjects be prepared to be read in the churches during the week of prayer:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.43*

1. Reading for fast-day, Sabbath, December 17, setting forth the importance of devoting the week of prayer to the special work of seeking God.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.44*

2. Sunday, December 18. The steps by which we place ourselves in a condition where God can accept us.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.45*

3. Monday, December 19. The blessing of God brought to us through faith. the value of such an experience.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.46*

4. Tuesday, December 20. The object of God's blessing and how it can be retained.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.47*

5. Wednesday, December 21. Missionary work in the home, church, and neighborhood-Mrs. E. G. White*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.48*

6. Thursday, December 22. Foreign Mission work, Great Britain, Scandinavia-Elders Olsen and Lane*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.49*

7. Friday, December 23. Foreign Mission work, Central Europe, Russia, etc.-Elder W. C. White*SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.50*

8. Sabbath, December 24. The obligation, privilege, and blessing of giving, and also setting forth the branches of the work most in need. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.51*

Fourth, We still further recommend that the delegates of this Conference do all in their power to enlist the interest, and secure the co-operation, of the ministers, in their several fields of labor, to help forward this work. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.52*

Moved by S. H. Lane to adopt the resolution by considering each item separately. Carried. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.53*

THIRD DAY

At 9 o'clock A.M. a meeting of the American Health and Temperance Association was held, the president, Dr. J. H. Kellogg, in the chair. Reports were called for from various parts of the field. Elder S. H. Lane reported for England, and gave a most interesting account of the temperance cause there. He said that in order to break down the influences of the public houses, the temperance people have started vegetarian restaurants, which had sprung at once into popular favor. In these lemonade is the strongest drink that can be had, and no meat at all. The *Good Health* has been placed in these restaurants, and has met with the greatest favor. Health literature has been sold in large quantities, and the influence of our health publications is most favorable in opening the way for the reception of the other parts of present truth. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 710.54*

Elder O. A. Olsen reported the same influence being exerted by the health literature in Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. There are seventeen colporteurs in Sweden, who are so successful as to be able to support themselves on the commission which they receive from the sale of health publications alone, and the commissions are not so large as in America. One young man, not of our faith, read the Swedish health journal and liked it so well that he subscribed for 400 copies to circulate among the public schools in that country. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.1*

Sister E. G. White, who had just arrived from St. Helena, then spoke for a few minutes on the importance of improving every opportunity to set ourselves before the people as a temperance people. The temperance work must go with the Bible doctrine. As our first parents lost Eden through indulgence of appetites, a way has been opened by the sacrifice of Christ whereby we may gain it by denial of appetite. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.2*

Our people do not take the extensive view of this work that they ought to. She then drew a parallel between Paul's time and ours. He would labor for a long time, drawing arguments from the types and shadows, showing an intimate knowledge of the Scriptures, and would thus gain the favor of the people. Then he would teach them that this Christ prefigured by the types had already come. So we should begin to work with the people from a standpoint where we can gain the favor of the people. How shall we leaven the world, unless we have something with which to lift them up? We must labor unselfishly for humanity. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.3*

Conference assembled at 3 o'clock. Reports from foreign fields were called for. Elder W. C. White spoke for Central Europe, and said that the workers were all of good courage, and the work prospering. Germany is really a more promising field than England. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.4*

Elder O. A. Olsen spoke for the Scandinavian work. The Denmark Conference has 9 churches with 230 members. The Swedish Conference has 10 churches and 288 members, besides 97 Sabbath-keepers who are not joined to any organization, making 365 in all in that country. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.5*

Elder Matteson held a four months' mission school in Stockholm, Sweden, and although the material upon which he had to work was most unpromising, some of the young people being ignorant to the very extreme, the result was excellent. They soon began to take subscribers for health journals, besides selling books. In nine months they took 2,335 subscribers for the Danish-Norwegian health journal, and received \$3,500 on subscriptions and book sales. There are some difficulties but none which cannot be overcome by the grace of God. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.6*

Elder Lane said that there had never been a time when he was discouraged over the work in England. In one city he began meetings, speaking to eight people, but the congregation soon increased so much that another place had to be secured. There are four churches in England, and their donations and tithes have reached \$625. Erelong a church will be organized in London. A room for a book depository has been secured in Paternoster Row, and the foundation is being laid for an extensive work in that city. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.7*

Elder Corliss spoke of the work in Australia. There are now 3 churches there and 150 members. The church

at Melbourne numbers 90, and the one at Ballarat about 50. There is a church in Adelaide, and a few Sabbath-keepers in Sydney, and some in other places. Between 300 hundred and 400 people have embraced the truth in Australia, but some have given it up. It is impossible for a man to get work after he begins to keep the Sabbath, and so some of them, after holding on for a while, give up. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.8*

It costs very much to carry on tent work there. Lumber comes from California and Oregon, and lumber suitable for seating costs \$100 per thousand. To avoid the expense, chair were bought. It cost \$200 to seat a fifty-foot tent, but the advantage is that chairs can be shipped at moderate cost. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.9*

W. C. White, A. R. Henry, and C. H. Jones were appointed a Committee on Year Book *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.10*

W. C. White then requested to be released from the Committee on Resolutions. His request was granted, and the President appointed E. J. Waggoner in his stead. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.11*

FOURTH DAY

At 9 A. M. the annual meeting of the Sanitarium Association was held. Dr. Kellogg gave an interesting sketch of the growth of the institution, from its organization in 1866 until the present. The net profits last year were \$40,000, and this year nearly as much. The net worth of the institution is now over \$200,000, and the amount of charity work done is more than twice as much as the amount of the original capital. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.12*

Sister White followed with remarks touching the necessity of broader plans for a judicious charity work. She also spoke of the Rural Health Retreat, as did also Elder Loughborough. There is now represented in the Health Retreat an investment of \$60,000. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.13*

Conference assembled at 3 o'clock. Elder S. Fulton spoke of the work in Florida. The cities and towns are largely inhabited by Northern people. Some people from New York City who were visiting in Florida attended the meetings and began keeping the Sabbath. One of the ladies told him that she never would have attended the meetings if the tent had been pitched in New York City, and would never have heard and accepted the truth if it had had to find her in that city. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.14*

The president stated that Brother C. W. Olds, of Wisconsin, who went south to canvas, had sold \$1,500 worth of books in Birmingham and vicinity, in Alabama. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.15*

The Committee on Resolutions presented the following:- *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.16*

WHEREAS, There has been during the past year steady and tangible progress in all departments of our work, notwithstanding increased obstacles thrown in its way, and more active opposition than heretofore, on the part of those who desire to hinder its progress; therefore, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.17*

1. Resolved, that we recognize in this prosperity and evident token of God's willingness to respond to the prayers and efforts of his people, and a prophecy that his counsel will guide and his hand defend and sustain this his work in the future; and, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.18*

WHEREAS, The increasing demands of our publications have rendered it necessary that both the Central and Pacific Publishing Associations should increase their facilities by enlarging the offices of publication at Battle Creek and Oakland, to nearly double their former capacity, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.19*

2. Resolved, That we commend the prompt action of the managers of both these associations in making their provision to meet the demand for our books and periodicals; and we regard this great increase in the circulation of our literature as a cheering evidence that this message is soon to arrest the attention of this generation. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.20*

3. Resolved, That we hail with pleasure the addition to our other periodicals, of a paper in the Holland language, and we are peculiarly grateful to God for the success which has so far attended its publication, and for the marked progress of his work among the people. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.21*

WHEREAS, the great religio-political crisis, in which will be involved last conflict between truth and error, is even now overshadowing our land; and, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.22*

WHEREAS, In these troublous times the Lord by the prophet (*Daniel 12:1*) Has assured protection to those only whose names are written in the book of life, and whose robes are washed and made White in the blood of the lamb; and, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.23*

WHEREAS, the success of the cause of truth depends not upon human efforts, but solely upon the power of God, which power can be secured only by bringing ourselves into such harmony with his will that we may become partakers of the divine nature, therefore, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.24*

4. *Resolved*, that we will, by the help of God, strive as never before to heed the injunction of the Scriptures, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," and so separate ourselves from all sin and impurity of heart and life, that the divine counsel may guide, and the divine power attend, all our efforts. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.25*

WHEREAS, The General Conference Association is a legally incorporated organization, capable of holding property and transacting business in any part of the world, and is therefore the proper body to look after the financial interest of our missions and other pioneer enterprises; and, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.26*

WHEREAS, This association, in order to do the important work it is designated to accomplish, and must have funds; therefore, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.27*

5. *Resolved*, That we recommend to those who have means to donate for the general advancement of the cause, or money which they can loan temporarily without interest, to deposit such means with this association, rather than with any institution which is more local in its operations. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.28*

Whereas, The opening of missions in foreign lands involves much expense, and is attended with many difficulties, therefore, *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.29*

6. *Resolved*, That we hail with much gratitude the progress of the work in the different countries of Europe, as seen in the organization of four Conferences, the establishment of three offices of publication, and a large interest that has been awakened all over Europe. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.30*

7. *Resolved*, That we approve of the efforts made in England, Central Europe and Scandinavia, in holding mission schools for the purpose of educating canvassers and colporteurs; and we hereby express our gratitude at the success of the canvassing work in those countries as a potent means of bringing the truth before the masses. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.31*

8. *Resolved*, That we approve of the removal of the office of publication in England from Great Grimsby to London, and the opening of a depot for our publications in Paternoster Row; and we bid the mission workers there Godspeed in their efforts to establish the cause on a firm basis in the very heart of the English-speaking world. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.32*

9. *Resolved*, That a standing committee of five be appointed by the Chairman, to confer with other committees which should be appointed in the various Conferences, in reference to the defense of those who may suffer persecution under repressive Sunday laws, and also to direct in efforts that may be needed in various States to oppose the passage of such Sunday laws. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.33*

These resolutions were all carefully considered, and with the exception of resolutions four and nine, were adopted. The two resolutions excepted were referred to a special committee of nine, who should consider the whole subject broached by them, and should frame a resolution defining our relation to the work of National Reform and the Sunday laws. The committee were also to plan for a daily class for instruction in National Reform principles and how to oppose them. U. Smith, A. T. Jones, E. J. Waggoner, L. McCoy, D. T. Jones, J. M. Rees, J. N. Loughborough, E. W. Farnsworth, and A. R. Henry were named as said committee. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.34*

Later items of interest will be found on the last page. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 711.35*

"Dreary Times" The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The following from the *Jewish Times* (San Francisco) will apply to any city:- xxx *SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.1*

"The community is treated to a series of scandals, rotten enough for ancient Babylon and Rome. The growth of vice in a young city, not yet forty years of age, is a strong argument against a pious belief that we are better than our fathers, and that the millennium is nearer than it has been. The catalogue of sins that infest the city of San Francisco is so appalling that one turns with disgust from the daily accounts in the newspapers. Whether the publication of these accounts will tend to diminish crime is an open question. It will surely, if nothing else, pervert the morals of the innocent, for it is unwholesome food, and excites a morbid appetite for literature that is none the less obscene because it is a presumably truthful account of the happenings in society. We live in dreary times. The churches of San Francisco are to-day mute witnesses of the fact that religion has to battle

harder than ever, and our schools are on the witness stand to prove that knowledge has not barred the progress of vice. It is enough to cause hypochondria. Will humanity ever remain the same? Will Satan ever retain the upper hand?" *SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.2*

Yes, vice is rampant, and on the increase; but Satan will not always triumph. Evil will soon be rooted out, and the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. *Isaiah 11:9*. It will not be, however, by the increase of education, or by the conversion of the world, but by the coming of Christ in his kingdom, who shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall slay the wicked. It will be by the destruction of Satan and all his works-the burning up, root and branch, of all that do wickedly-and the renovation of the earth, so that in it righteousness may dwell. Until that time "wicked men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived;" but when that time comes there will be such a revolution as the universe has never yet be held. Happy will it then be for those who resist the tide of evil that is carrying so many willing victims to ruin. Yes, these are drear times, but better times are coming for those to whom these times are indeed dreary. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.3*

"The Ministers Aroused" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The religious papers of New York are very much agitated over the matter of Sunday observance. About three weeks ago a large meeting of leading clergymen of New York and vicinity was held to consider the propriety of taking concerted action against the opening of the liquor saloons on Sunday. The Rev. Dr. John Hall was chairman of the meeting, and at his suggestion a committee was appointed to draw up resolutions expressing the sense of the meeting. They recommended that all the pastors be urgently requested to present to their people their duty regarding the maintenance and the enforcement of the laws regarding the sale of liquors on Sunday; that a public meeting be called for the purpose of calling attention to the advantages to be derived by the whole community from the preservation of Sunday as a day of periodic rest; that the position of every candidate for election to the Senate or Assembly be definitely ascertained, and that they take steps to secure the defeat of any candidate who declines to pledge himself to defend Sunday laws; and that a committee be appointed to secure the dissemination of English and German reading matter upon the subject. All the denominations were represented on the committee that was called for in the last resolution, and it was stated that an effort would be made to get either Archbishop Corrigan or Mgr. Preston to represent the Roman Catholic Church in the committee. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.4*

The above facts are abridged from a report in the *New York Observer*, under the heading, "The Ministers Aroused." The concluding paragraph of the article is as follows: *-SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.5*

"Several of the ministers present made brief remarks, Dr. Hall suggesting that there should be special preaching on the matter in all the churches on the following Sunday. The tone of the meeting was one of intense earnestness. It is evident that the action of the liquor men in endeavoring to secure a repeal of the Sabbath laws has awakened a sentiment among the Christian people of the State that will make itself felt at the coming election." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.6*

If anything more were needed to show that the Sunday movement is simply a movement in favor of an establishment of religion, we find it in an expression in the *Christian Union's* account of the same meeting. It says of the effort to have saloons open on Sunday: "The clergy can halt this movement for the destruction of the most sacred and imminent symbol of their holy religion, if they will." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.7*

This is a fair sample of all the movements to make Sunday laws. They take the guise of shutting up the saloons, and then those who do not believe in enforced Sunday observance, and do not join the movement, are denounced as enemies of temperance. We say emphatically that there is not the shadow of temperance principle in the effort to close saloons on Sunday. It is simply an entering wedge by the clergy to preserve "the most sacred and eminent symbol of their holy religion." It is an effort to secure by civil law that which "their holy religion" has not vitality enough to do. Now we are staunch friends of temperance; we are foes to the saloons, and would gladly and enthusiastically unite in any movement to close them altogether, seven days a week. But no lover of religious liberty can join a pseudo-temperance movement, whose sole object is to force a religious custom (an unwarranted one at that) upon the people, leaving the saloons as much power as before. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.8*

While we place ourselves on record as uncompromisingly opposed to saloons, we wish to emphasize the statement that the Sunday movements are in the interest of the liquor traffic rather than against it. For (1) if there is power among the clergy to close the saloons one day in the week, there is power to close them every day in the week; and the fact that, having that power, they do not use it, shows that they are not really concerned over the ravages of the liquor traffic, provided it does not encroach upon the symbol of "their [not God's] holy religion;" and (2) the formal action of the clergy in taking steps to close the saloons only on

Sunday, when they have the power to close them every day, gives the saloons standing in society; it is a sort of indorsement by the highest profession of the saloons for the last six days of the week.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.9*

Let it not be forgotten that in this effort to secure the preservation of "the most sacred and imminent symbol of their holy religion," the clergy are anxious to secure the co-operation of the Roman Catholic Church. They need not fear, for the Sunday institution is the most imminent, and indeed the only real symbol of the power of the Catholic Church, and she will guard her own. How complacently she must look upon the Protestants who are making themselves her willing servants. *W. SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.10*

"The Spirit of Antichrist. No. 1" The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

In 1 *John 4:1-3* we find the following inspired warning and declaration:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.11*

"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.12*

Again to 2 *John 7* we find a similar statement: "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist. This is a deceiver and an antichrist." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.13*

"Antichrist" means "opposed to Christ." The great antichrist, therefore, is Satan himself, for he is the instigator and abettor of everything that has ever come up in opposition to God and Christ. In *Revelation 12:7-9* we find the following description of the first opposition to the Son of God, and its result:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.14*

"And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels, and prevailed not; neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world; he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." *Revelation 12:7-9. SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.15*

Michael is the archangel (*Jude 9*), that is, the chief or prince of the angels; and the archangel is Christ, for it is the voice of the archangel that will be heard at the last great day, when the dead shall be raised (*1 Thessalonians 4:16*); and Christ declared (*John 5:26-29*) that his own voice would be the one that should penetrate the graves, and called forth the dead. Therefore this war in heaven was between Christ and his angels on one side, and Satan and his angels on the other side. It was the beginning of the great controversy which has been going on till the present time. When Christ was on earth he again met the devil in person, and again vanquished him; but still the warfare is kept up; Satan still opposes Christ by seeking to blind the minds of men so that the light of the glorious gospel of Christ may not shine unto them (*2 Corinthians 4:3, 4*); and the contest will cease only with the utter destruction of Satan and all his works.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.16*

The apostle, however, in the text first quoted, does not speak of antichrist himself, but of the "spirit of antichrist;" that is, not of Satan in person, but of the doctrines which he disseminates in order to blind the minds of them that believe not. This spirit of antichrist is declared to be a denial that Jesus is come in the flesh. It is commonly supposed that this refers to Roman Catholicism. This is probably because in *2 Thessalonians 2:3*, the Papacy is spoken of as the one, "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worship." There is no question but that Roman Catholicism is antichrist; but we propose to demonstrate that what is known as modern Spiritualism is essentially the spirit of antichrist, being the direct mouth-piece of Satan himself, and that Roman Catholicism and other forms of error, whether of greater or lesser degree, are only outgrowths of the principle which is the very heart of Spiritualism.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.17*

Our first business is to inquire what it is to deny that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. Of course the most direct method of denying that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is to deny the entire narrative contained in the gospels, to say that the whole thing is a fabrication, and that there never was such a person as Jesus Christ. But there are comparatively few in enlightened lands who deny that such a person as Jesus Christ ever lived on this earth. Many who will admit that such a person lived, and that he was a very good man, possibly the best man that ever lived, will still deny his divinity; they will not admit that he was the *Son of God*. Such persons do most emphatically deny that Jesus Christ is come the flesh, and are therefore deceived by the

spirit of antichrist. But there is still another way in which the spirit of antichrist may be manifested, and that is by denying some essential part of the work of Christ, while still professing, to believe on him. Representatives of this class are brought to view in *Matthew 7:21-23*. This working of the spirit of antichrist is the most insidious of all, and is that which will wreck the greater part of those who will be lost. Let us examine it.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.18*

In the first chapter of John we have undoubted reference to Christ, under the title of "the Word." "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." In the fourteenth verses we read of him: "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." Grace means favor. Therefore the statement is that the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, full of favor. That is the same as saying that Christ came in the flesh as an exhibition of the favor of God to man. And in harmony with this are the words of Paul, "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." *2 Corinthians 5:19*. "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (*1 Timothy 1:13*); he was "full of grace;" and so the apostle declares that the grace of God brings salvation. *Titus 2:11*. Now go back again to the statement that when Christ was made flesh and dwelt among us, he was full of favor. This favor was the favor of God, for his fullness was the fullness of God (*Colossians 1:19; 2:9*), and God was manifest in him, reconciling the world to himself. Now we read in *Psalms 30:5* that "in his favor is life." Therefore we conclude that Jesus Christ was made flesh and dwelt among us full of favor, in order to give life to men doomed to death; and this conclusion is strengthened by the statement, "In him was life; and the life was the light of man." *John 1:4*.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.19*

The following texts show plainly that Christ's sole object in coming to this earth was to give life to those who otherwise would not have had it: *John 3:16*: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The obvious conclusion is that if he had not come, all men would have perished, and that although he has come, and none will have life except those who believe in him. And this conclusion is stated in so many words, in *John 3:36*: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 712.20*

1 John 5:10-12: "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.1*

John 10:9, 10: "I am the door; by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture. The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy; I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.2*

These texts abundantly prove that to give life was the sole object of the manifestation of Christ in the flesh. Therefore we say that to deny that he alone gives life,-to claim that without Christ man may have life-even under the most distressing conditions-is virtually to deny that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, and is consequently the spirit of antichrist. For to deny the essential part of Christ's work,-to deny the very thing and the only thing for which he was manifested in the flesh, full of grace and truth,-is the same as denying that he ever was manifest in the flesh at all. If men may have life without Christ, then his words, "Ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life," they might have responded, "We don't need to, for we can have life, without coming to you." And this they did say in effect.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.3*

The spirit of antichrist which is in the world is, therefore, when traced to its very simplest form, merely a denial that man is dependent upon Christ for life; it is the claim that all men will have life, whether they believe in Christ or not. This spirit is pre-eminently exemplified in modern Spiritualism. The fundamental principle of Spiritualism, and, indeed, the whole sum and substance of it, is the doctrine of the natural immortality of man. We will let Spiritualists define it in their own words. N. F. Ravlin, formerly a Baptist minister, and now one of the leading Spiritualist lecturers in California says:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.4*

"The very central truth of Spiritualism is the power and possibility of spirit return, under certain conditions, to communicate with those in the material form." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.5*

Mrs. E. L. Watson, a noted "inspirational" lecturer, in an address in San Francisco, in the *Golden Gate* of February 6, 1886, said:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.6*

"Spiritualism *per se* is a science; it is the demonstration of certain facts relative to the nature of man; it explains the psychical phenomena which have transpired in the past, and the mysteries which have surrounded us as spiritual beings. It demonstrates the fact of man's continued existence after death, and enlightens us in regard to the manner of that existence." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.7*

The standing motto of the *Spiritual Magazine*, for many years the leading Spiritualist publication in England,

was this:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.8*

"Spiritualism is based on the cardinal fact of spirit communion and influx; it is the effort to discover all truth relating to man's spiritual nature, capacities, relations, duties, welfare, and destiny, and its application to a regenerative life. It recognizes a *continuous divine inspiration* in man. It aims, through a careful, reverent study of facts, at a knowledge of the laws and principles which govern the occult forces of the universe; of the relations of spirit to matter, and of man to God and the spiritual world. It is thus catholic and progressive, leading to true religion as at one with the highest philosophy." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.9*

In an article entitled, "Spiritualism and Religion," in the *Golden Gate* of July 9, 1887, John Weatherlee said:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.10*

"The central idea of modern Spiritualism is the key-stone of the religious arch. That is, a continued existence." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.11*

But the central idea of Spiritualism is diametrically opposed to the Bible, for that declares that there is no such thing as continued existence for man unless he is one of the righteous ones who shall be alive when the Lord comes, and who will be translated. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.12*

The patriarch Job said: "But man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." *Job 14:10-12*. And he adds: "His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." *Verse 21. SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.13*

The psalmist says: "For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" *Psalms 6:5*. Again: "The dead praise not the Lord, neither in the that go down into silence." *Psalms 115:17*. Again, still more positively: "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to the earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." *Psalms 146:3, 4. SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.14*

Solomon wrote: "For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope: for a living dog is better than a dead lion. For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.15*

No matter how poor or how ignorant a man may be, he is infinitely richer and knows infinitely more than a dead man. The man who has barely conscience enough to know that he is going to die, and who knows not another thing, knows far more than a dead man; for the dead know not anything, - their thoughts have perished. *SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.16*

The dead are represented as dwelling in the dust, asleep. Thus *Isaiah 26:19*: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." And *Daniel 12:2*: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." *SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.17*

All the Scripture declarations, and many more of like import - for the Bible teaches nothing different on this point - are contradicted by Spiritualism, which declares that man has a continued existence, and that there is no death. But this contradiction of the plain declaration of the Bible shows Spiritualism to be inspired by the spirit of antichrist; for the prophets spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost (*2 Peter 1:21*), and the Spirit of Christ was in them dictating all that they wrote. *1 Peter 1:10, 11. W. SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.18*

"The Sunday and the Saloon" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The action of the "Personal Liberty League" of New York and Pennsylvania in demanding open saloons on Sunday from 2 P.M. till midnight, has given to the Sunday cause such an impetus as it probably has not had since the days of Constantine; and the reason of it is that the impetus is wholly political. The religious papers with one voice advocate decided and positive political action, and so do many of the secular papers. Principles have no place. All consideration of principle is given to the winds, and everything is rallied to the political protection of Sunday. This demand of the liquor interests does not seem at all to have enlarged the genuine prohibition sentiments of the public; it is only Sunday prohibition that is demanded. The following from the *New York Observer* is a sample of the general discussion of the subject:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page*

"It may be thought by some that the personal liberty movement will not materially affect the business portion of our communities, or, in other words, that it will not touch the pockets of our reputable business men, and therefore can hardly be expected to interest them as much as if that were the case. Of course this is a very important point,-the pocket,-and a very tender one. But the movement.. Sabbath, a saloon day, may affect that particular spot quite seriously. If the Legislature should pass a law opening the grog-shops on Sunday it may be followed by a considerable exodus from the State of respectable, law-abiding, Sabbath-loving people. In this city, for example, which lies within easy distance of two other States, the question of choosing a suburban residence might be determined for many by this Sunday-saloon business."*SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.20*

Oh, yes! the saloon, with all its abominable evils, can run day and night six days in the week, and the "respectable, law-abiding, Sabbath-loving people" can stand it all without a murmur, and can choose their suburban or other residences without any special thoughts of an exodus. But, oh! oh! oh! the Sunday saloon is an awful evil. At the mere suggestion of the *Sunday* saloon, there is danger of an exodus of these exemplary people. So the evil is not in the saloon itself, it is only in the *Sunday* saloon. We verily believe that if the Sunday elements throughout the country would with one consent agree and faithfully stand to the agreement to shut all the saloons during the whole of Sunday, they could go on unquestioned during the other days and nights of the week, and there would not be enough prohibition element in the nation to cause a ripple on the surface of public affairs. The force that can abolish the Sunday saloon can abolish the saloon altogether. Then why is it not done?*SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.21*

The truth is that it is not the prohibited liquor traffic, but the *enforced Sunday*, that they want.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 713.22*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

When we talk against sympathizing with a criminal, some people will accuse us of a lack of charity. Such persons do not know the meaning either of sympathy or charity. We pity a criminal condemned to death; we may pity him because of his fate, and because of his lawless disposition. But we may not sympathize with him, for that implies a fellow-feeling; it indicates that we are at heart partakers of his crimes. Any feeling which leads one to try to save a criminal from just punishment, does not arise from charity. Such a feeling argues disregard for the law, but charity rejoices not in iniquity, but exalts law.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.1*

It is customary for the Methodist ministers of San Francisco to meet together every Monday morning, to compare notes, discuss questions of varying degrees of importance, etc. From the report of the last one held we extract the following:-*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.2*

"Rev. Dr. Wythe, of Oakland, then read a very interesting paper to prove that the brain is not, as is generally supposed, the special seat of the mind. He maintained that the mind is an independent organization which may operate at any part of the body, and preside at any given time where its action is required. There are, he said, three grades of organization-physical, psychical, and spiritual. The first is the lowest, embracing the sensuous, then the psychical, embracing all mathematical and purely intellectual forms, while the highest grade is the spiritual, embracing all religious conceptions and moral ideas, and being in fact itself the basis of morality. The practical effect of this view, Dr. Wythe remarked, would be to do away with materialism by showing that the mind can act independently of the brain."*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.3*

We would like to know the arguments by which these remarkable propositions were "maintained." How did the Doctor find out that the brain is not the seat of the mind? If the brain does not do the thinking, what does? Is thought itself an entity? and if so, of what is it made? Is it gathered from the air? These are a few of the many questions we would like to ask. And one more: If it is all as Dr. Wythe says, will he tell us what the brain is good for anyway?-his own, for instance.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.4*

The gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation.*Romans 1:16*. Salvation has reference to sin, for Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners (*1 Timothy 1:15*), and that is why he was called Jesus, which means Saviour. *Matthew 1:21*. If it were not for sin there would be no need of the gospel; therefore wherever and whenever God authorizes the preaching of the gospel, it must be that there is sin. What is sin? "Sin is the transgression of the law." *1 John 3:4*. What law? The law which says, "thou shalt not covet." *Romans 7:7*. And what law is that? The ten commandments, which God spoke with his own voice from mount Sinai, and wrote onto tables of stone. See *Exodus 20:3-17; Deuteronomy 10:4*. Then since the gospel is preached only where there is sin, and sin is the transgression of the ten commandments, it must be that wherever and whenever the gospel is preached, the ten commandments must be in existence as the rule of life. And how extensively

and how long is the gospel to be preached? "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness under all nations; and then shall the end come." *Matthew 24:14*. What is the "end" here spoken of? The end of the world. See *Matthew 24:3*. Then just so surely as the Bible is the word of God, the ten commandments must be of binding obligation at least until the coming of Christ, and the end of the world. Whoever denies this, denies the gospel. Let anyone gainsay this reasoning and conclusion who can.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.5*

Last week we promised that we would speak further concerning the Chicago anarchists, and the sympathy that was shown them. It is well known by all who have given the daily papers even a cursory examination, that sympathy almost without stint was lavished upon the anarchists while they were under sentence of death. Now many people see in this nothing alarming, but we say that it indicates a moral condition that will eventually be disastrous to this country. Now many people see in this nothing alarming, but we say that it indicates a moral condition that will eventually be disastrous to this country. These men were red-handed murderers; they had caused the death of seven men, and the severe injury of many more. It was not their fault that they did not kill hundreds for the bombs were thrown into a crowd. These men, who were actually guilty of killing seven men, and constructively guilty of killing hundreds received attention from thousands, while their victims and their families were passed by with scarcely a thought. Why? Because there is a widespread sympathy with lawlessness. Let the most commonplace man commit a heinous offense, and straightway he becomes a hero; and the worse his offense, the more attention he will receive.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.6*

It is claimed that this country is in no danger whatever from anarchists. The newspapers are congratulating themselves and the people that anarchy is now stamped out of this country. Not by any means. Anarchy is simply a lack of law; the spirit of anarchy is the spirit of lawlessness; sympathy with lawlessness is sympathy with anarchy; and sympathy for a lawless person in his lawless acts is sympathy with lawlessness. We say that the widespread sympathy that was aroused for those men who were willing to slay hundreds in order to overturn law and order, shows that in "free America" there is a disregard for the sacredness of the law, and that is the spirit of anarchy.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.7*

A good many people imagine that they love law and order, when they do not. It is a fact that many, indeed the great majority of men, are perfectly indifferent as to whether or not the laws are enforced, so long as they themselves do not suffer by their violation. Laws are enforced in this country principally from selfish motives, and not from a love of justice. There is a not an abhorrence of evil because it is evil. Men will make an outcry against a crime which involves their interests, and will excuse the same if they are in no way concerned. This is evidence that the law is not considered sacred and it is a necessary consequence of the teaching that the law of God does not now have any claims upon men. When men have become accustomed to seeing God's law trampled underfoot with impunity, it is the most natural thing in the world that they should esteem human laws lightly. The greater portion of the inhabitants of the earth, including many professed Christians, are anarchists so far as the law of God is concerned, and if they are not open anarchists in relation to human laws, it is not through any virtue of their own. There is no nation on earth that is to-day more in danger from the assaults of anarchists than the United States.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.8*

The spirit of anarchy is just what the students of prophecy would expect to see rife at the present day, and the fact that it is so prevalent as shown by the sympathy for crime and criminals, even among what are called the "best classes," is an evidence that we are in the last days. Hear the words of the apostle Paul: "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves." There you have a clear sign of the last days. The ground both of the Decalogue,-the one which...*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.9*

"Laborers for the Harvest-field" The Signs of the Times, 13, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

At the seventh meeting of the Conference session the Committee on the Distribution of Labor made a partial report, of which the following are the chief items: It was recommended that Elder S. H. Lane take charge of the work in Georgia and Florida, and that those two States be organized into a Conference as soon as consistent; that Elder O. C. Godsmark, of Indiana, go with Elder Lane to the South; that Elder J. P. Henderson, of Indiana, go to Arkansas to labor; that Elder Victory Thompson make Indiana his field of labor; that Elder G. G. Rupert, who has been laboring in South America, go to Michigan; that Elder G. C. Tenney, of Minnesota, after spending a few months at the office of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, proceed to Australia, to work upon the *Bible Echo*; that Elder A. D. Olsen take the presidency of the Minnesota Conference, and W. B. White of the Dakota Conference; that Elder E. H. Gates go to Colorado and take the presidency of that Conference, and that C. P. Haskell, of Colorado, take the place on the Ohio Conference Committee made vacant by Elder Gates; that J. M. Erickson make Sweden his field of labor; and that H. R. Johnson take the oversight of the Scandinavian work in Iowa and South Dakota. All these recommendations were adopted.*SITI*

November 24, 1887, page 720.10

The officers of both the General Conference and the International Sabbath-school Association have been elected for the ensuing year, and are as follows-Conference officers: President, Elder Geo. I. Butler; Secretary, Elder U. Smith, Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. M. H. Chapman; Treasurer, A. R. Henry; Committee: Elders Geo. I. Butler, S. N. Haskell, O. A. Olsen, W. C. White, R. A. Underwood, U. Smith, R. M. Kilgore. The General Conference constitution was so amended as to provide for three more secretaries: One for Foreign Missions, one for Home Missions, and one for the educational work. These have not yet been elected.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.11*

The officers of the International Sabbath-school Association, as elected, are: President, C. H. Jones; Vice-President, W. C. White; Secretary, Winnie Loughborough; Executive Committee, C. H. Jones, W. C. White, E. W. Farnsworth, E. J. Waggoner, F. E. Belden, Winnie Loughborough, and R. S. Owen of California. A motion to so amend the constitution as to provide for a corresponding secretary has been referred to a committee.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.12*

From the publishers of the *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich., we have received a copy of the well-known book, "Thoughts on Daniel," in the Dutch language. It is unnecessary for us to say anything concerning the contents of this book, for it has been before our readers for a long time; but we can recommend the style of the book in the (to us) unknown tongue. There are a great many Hollanders in different portions of this country who would gladly read this book if it were presented to them; and while there is no doubt but that a canvasser would succeed better if he could talk with them in their own tongue, yet experience has shown that a canvasser who speaks only English may have good success in canvassing among the Dutch. We confidently expect that this work will have the circulation both in this country and in Holland, which its merits demand. Order from *Review and Herald*, Battle Creek, Mich., or from Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal. Price, \$1.50.*SITI November 24, 1887, page 720.13*

December 1, 1887

"The Spirit of Antichrist. No. 2" The Signs of the Times, 13, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

The next point to be considered is what is actually involved in this claim that all men are by nature immortal. We state as a proposition, that the claim that man are by nature immortal actually implies nothing less than that they are equal with God, and independent of him. This proposition we shall now approved.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.1*

1. Immortality belongs to God alone. Paul speaks of "the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto." *1 Timothy 6:15, 16*. Christ, as the only begotten Son of God, shares this attribute with the Father: "For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." *John 5:26*. Angels are immortal, but only because God has given them immortality; men may obtain immortality, but only as the gift of God, bestowed on them through Christ, only, however, to those who seek it by patient continuance in well-doing. *Romans 6:23; 2:7*. Now for a man to claim one of the attributes of God, is virtually to claim all of them. Especially is this true if the attribute claimed be immortality; for the possession of life involves everything else. To claim immortality is to claim the very highest attribute of a Deity. God's most sacred name is Jehovah,-the One who is,-and when he would give Moses the highest possible credentials, he said, "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." *Exodus 3:14*. So for a man to claim immortality as his own by right is to claim for himself equality with God, or at least to claim that he is a part of God.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.2*

2. The great, and, indeed, the only reason why we should serve the Lord with all our heart, and with all our power, is because he has created us, and we live only by his favor. Said the holy angels in Heaven, "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for thou hast created all things." *Revelation 4:11*. And Paul, in proving to the Athenians that God alone should be worshiped, used only the argument that "he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things," and that "in him we live, and move, and have our being." *Acts 17:25, 28*. Now if it were true that we are immortal, and that our life, either present or future, is not dependent on the special favor of God, but that we shall continue to exist for ever, no matter what our character or condition, then it would be true that we would owe no allegiance to God nor to anyone else but ourselves. The claim that man is by nature immortal is virtually a claim that he is independent of God. So again we see that for man to claim immortality for themselves is to make themselves gods, or, at least, a part of God.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.3*

3. If man were immortal, like God, then, as stated above, he would be independent of God, owing no allegiance to anybody but himself; and in that case he would, necessarily, be his own law-giver and his own judge. Each man would determine for himself what his course of action would be, and *right* would be for each individual whatever his nature should prompt him to do. These conclusions are self-evident, and prove the main proposition, that the claim of natural immortality for man is a virtually a claim that men are gods, having all the attributes that the Bible ascribes to the one only true God. And this again shows that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is inspired by the spirit of antichrist, for Christ is God. *John 1:1*. Whatever dishonors either the Father or the Son dishonors the other.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.4*

Having thus briefly but positively shown that the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul is of the very essence of the spirit of antichrist, we shall proceed to show (1) that modern Spiritualism, the foundation-stone of which is continued existence for man, does most positively deny both God and Christ; (2) that all teaching having natural immortality as its basis has ever been opposed to God; and (3) that the teaching that man is by nature immortal always leads directly and surely to immortality,-that it is indeed because of all the wickedness that has ever disgraced this earth. We quote first the statements of leading Spiritualist writers.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.5*

The editor of the *Golden Gate*, which is probably the ablest and most respectable Spiritualist journal in the United States, in his issue of November 27, 1886, said:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.6*

"As Spiritualists repudiate the horrible doctrine of election, as taught by certain branches of the churches; as they believe in no Satanic personality, and have no use for an eternal hell in an orthodox sense, they would naturally be regarded by those who still adhere to those old traditions as outside the pale of redemption,-as indeed they are, vicariously, but not in reality; for they realize that if they ever attained happiness in this life or the next it must be through their own efforts, in response to the aspirations of their own souls.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.7*

"When a man learns that the only Satan in the universe is his own ignorance and the evil propensities and

appetites engendered thereof; and when he learns that in all of God's great plan of creation there is no one but himself to answer for his own inequities, it would seem, if he stops to think, that he would 'seek the better way,' and cease to do evil." *SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.8*

In this passage the editor makes reference to "God's great plan of creation," yet he claims for man absolute independence of God, making man and not God the judge of right and wrong. Again, in the *Golden Gate* of July 2, 1887, we find the following editorial statement:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.9*

"The spirits also teach us that there is no atonement or remission of sin except through growth; that as we sow, so also must we reap. They have not found God, and never will, except as they find him in their own souls." *SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.10*

Still more direct is a statement made by a correspondent of the *Golden Gate*, in the issue of September 10, 1887:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.11*

"When the truth was made known to me that 'God is life, love, truth, intelligence, substance, omnipresent, omnipotent, and omniscient, and there is no evil,' I became glorified in myself as a part of that God." *SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.12*

Light in the West, a spiritualist paper published in St. Louis, Mo., contained the following, August 14, 1886:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.13*

"Man is a part of God, a spark thrown off from the Great Spirit." *SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.14*

W. J. Colville is considered one of the greatest of Spiritualist lecturers. He lectures wholly by "inspiration," and is held in as high esteem by Spiritualists as Christ is by Christians. In a lecture delivered in Oakland, Cal., June 19, 1886, he used the following language in answer to the question, "Where and what is Heaven, and where and what is hell?" *SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.15*

"The mind of man is the original creator both of that heaven and that hell which your own individual mind or spirit may realize; and no matter what your theological premises may be, the creed you espouse or the doctrines you favor, you cannot obliterate human conscience; and so long as you cannot obliterate human conscience, you will know hell until you are *reconciled with conscience*, and as soon as you are reconciled with conscience you will know heaven. There can be no heaven unless there be a perfect reconciliation between the impulses of man's highest soul and his outward life; there can be no heaven until your individual life is *guided by the divine within* you, that ever points out to you the road which is the perfect way."-*Golden Gate, September 3, 1887. SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.16*

In a lecture delivered by the "inspirational lecturer," J. J. Morse, at the Spiritualist camp-meeting held in Oakland, June, 1887, the following statement was made:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.17*

"Truth is the voice of God speaking through the human soul." *SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.18*

Now take the gist of all these statements, and we find it to be that man himself is God, and that every man is a law unto himself. Recall the statement of the *Spiritual Magazine*, that Spiritualism "recognizes a continuous divine inspiration in man;" the utterance of the editor of the *Golden Gate*, that man cannot find God except as they find him in their own souls; and that of Mr. Colville, that a man is in Heaven only when he is "reconciled with conscience," and "guided by the divine within;" and the last one quoted, namely, that "Truth is the voice of God speaking through the human soul," and what must we conclude? Simply that Spiritualism teaches that man must follow the impulses of his own nature, and that, wherever they may lead him, he is answerable for his actions to no one but himself. To show that this conclusion is warranted, we make a few more quotations. In a Spiritualist paper called *Lucifer*, published at Valley Falls, Kansas, in an article entitled "Marriage and Free Love" (July 15, 1887), we find the following:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.19*

"I acknowledge the presence of a power which we call Nature, and whatever Nature approves I encourage, and whatever Nature punishes I tried to avoid, such rewards and punishments being measured by the increase or decrease of personal happiness. It matters little to me whether moralists or reformers approve or condemn free love or marriage; the only question before me is to find out if Nature rewards one more than the other." *SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.20*

Hon. J. B. Hall, in a lecture reported in the *Banner of Light* of the February 6, 1864, says:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.21*

"I believe that man is amenable to no law not written upon his own nature, no matter by whom it is given.... By his own nature must he be tried-by his own acts he must stand or fall. True, man must give an account to God for all his deeds; but how? Solely by giving the account to his own nature-to himself." *SITI December 1, 1887,*

Now in order to know the consequences that will result from holding that man is the sole judge of his own actions, and that a man's natural inclinations are but the voice of God, and are to be followed, we have only to ascertain what is the nature of man. Christ, who "knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man" (*John 2:24, 25*), spoke as follows concerning what men are by nature:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.23*

"For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness; all these evil things come from within, and defile the man." *Mark 7:21-23*.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.24*

Solomon says of the heart, that "out of it are the issues of life." *Proverbs 4:2*. Therefore when Jesus mentioned "all these evil things," and said that they proceed "from within, out of the heart of man," he meant that man naturally exhibit just such traits in their lives. The apostle Paul bore witness to the same thing when he wrote:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.25*

"There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes." *Romans 3:10-18*.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.26*

This is the uniform testimony of the Scripture concerning all men, for Paul simply quoted what had been written by other inspired men. One more quotation will suffice to complete the picture of the natural tendencies of mankind. The man who is unrenewed by the Spirit of God is said to be "in the flesh;" and the "works of the flesh" are thus enumerated:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.27*

"Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." *Galatians 5:19-21*.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.28*

This is a picture of the natural impulses of the human heart. It is a description of what will be done by all who, unrestrained, follow the leadings of their own nature. And this is not spoken of one man or of any particular set of men, but of mankind universally. The king on the throne, the beggar in the hovel, the learned scientist, and the ignorant peasant, the pious Doctor of Divinity, and the blasphemous ruffian, all have one common human nature. The natural impulses of the heart are essentially the same. A godly ancestry will often give one less of evil to contend with than another, but this does not disprove the general statements; it is simply one of the restraints that God has provided, only the restraint operates before the individual is born, instead of after.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 726.29*

It is true that all who believe that they are their own judges do not exhibit in their lives all the vices above enumerated; but it is only because there are certain restraints imposed upon them. But let them be in a country where the authority of God was wholly disregarded, and where all believed in the following their own impulses, and they would prove the truth of the words of the Bible.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.1*

Now let us trace our argument backwards: 1. The tendency of the human heart is evil, and only evil. 2. Spiritualism teaches that each man is to follow the leadings of his own nature, and is to be the sole judge of his own actions. 3. This teaching of Spiritualism is a legitimate and necessary consequence of its teaching that there is "a continuous divine inspiration in man," and that man himself is God, or a part of God. 4. And the idea that man is a part of God, necessarily goes hand in hand with the idea that he is possessed of an immortal, indestructible nature. So we say that the natural tendency of the teaching that man is by nature immortal is toward unrestrained vice. When Spiritualists teach that all the god that men will find is in their own natures, they directly deify vice and crime. But Spiritualism is simply the doctrine that men have a continued existence without any break at what is called death. Therefore we repeat that the doctrine that man is by nature immortal, tends directly to immortality, and to that alone. If many who believe in that doctrine do love truth and right, and do live moral and upright lives, it is only because they have not yet followed that doctrine to its legitimate, ultimate results. God grant that such may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil before it is too late. W.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.2*

"Items from the General Conference" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

The last edition of last week's report was the election of the officers of the Conference for next year, which took place Sunday, November 20, the seventh day of the meeting. The next day the constitution of the Conference was amended so as to allow the election of a home missionary secretary, a foreign missionary secretary, and an educational secretary. These officers have not been elected at present writing. Their duties will be to have a general oversight of the work in their respective branches. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.3*

A very interesting meeting of the International Sabbath-school Association was held on Sunday afternoon. At this meeting the following-named persons were elected officers of the association for the coming year: President, C. H. Jones; Vice-President, W. C. White; Secretary and Treasurer, Winnie E. Loughborough; Executive Committee, C. H. Jones, W. C. White, E. J. Waggoner, F. E. Belden, E. W. Farnsworth, Winnie Loughborough, R. S. Owen. At a subsequent meeting, the constitution was changed so as to make unnecessary the election of a Publishing Committee, and to allow of the election of a corresponding secretary. Mrs. Jesse F. Waggoner gave an interesting talk upon the subject of "Teachers and Teaching," the following synopsis of which may be as interesting and profitable to the readers of the SIGNS as the talk was to those who listened:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.4*

"A teacher," she said, "is one who causes another to know something that he did not know before. A Sabbath-school teacher is one who causes another to know the way to Heaven; and the successful teacher will also cause others to walk in that way. But in order to do that, the teacher must himself be walking in the way to Heaven." She suggested that some might be discouraged because of their imperfections, but said that we need not be discouraged. She said that while crossing the Sierras recently, she had noticed flumes for conducting water for mining and irrigating purposes. In many places these flumes were so imperfect that they leaked badly, and she wondered how any of the water ever reached the destination, but concluded that it was because it flowed so swiftly over the bad places. The application was this; though imperfect, if we receive the waters of divine truth fresh from the Fountain-head, and are constantly conveying them to others so that the stream does not become stagnant, we may by the blessing of God accomplish much good notwithstanding our imperfections. We must be constantly receiving supplies from the Fountain-head. We sometimes notice the hills when they are all dead and dry and there is scarcely a green spot to be seen anywhere, and again we see lawns that are constantly green; the former have not received a supply of moisture; the latter have water every day. Just so if we teachers would be green and fresh we must be watered by divine grace daily. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.5*

Perhaps the most interesting facts presented were those upon the model teacher. The successful artist studies his model, so the successful teacher must study Christ, for he is the model Teacher. He was in love with his work, and so the successful Sabbath-school teacher must be in love with his work. Christ studied his scholars and knew all about them, and so we must study our scholars and learn all we can of their disposition and surroundings. All must not be treated alike. What would be good for one would spoil another, and if we would be successful we must adapt ourselves to each child and use illustrations which each will understand. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.6*

Christ always had something important to say. The way for us to have something important to say is to read, study, think, and PRAY. Anciently the sacrifice had to be prepared before God would accept it, and so we must be prepared if we would have divine help and sustenance. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.7*

Christ always gained the attention of his scholars; we, too, must follow our Model in this. To do this, we must be prompt, quiet, and reverent. The teacher should get close to his scholars, and make them feel that he is not afraid of them. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.8*

Christ was careful to make himself understood. Just so the successful teacher must make himself understood. The teacher should crack the nuts at home, and bring only the kernels to Sabbath-school. Do not use big words, and do not use any words that the children do not understand. Sometimes very simple words have to be explained to children; for instance, a child who has always lived in the city may not know anything about wells, springs, and woods, while the country child knows nothing about those things that are familiar to those in the city. It was also suggested that care be exercised in asking questions. Questions should be plain and definite, and yet not leading. For instance, the question, "What was David?" would admit of a dozen correct answers, and yet no one of them be the one that the teacher had in mind and wishes to draw out, while the question, "Was David a good man or a bad man?" admits of but one answer, and yet requires the child to exercise some thought. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.9*

Christ made use of all helps in his reach. He used illustrations and gave object lessons. The world is full of objects that may be used as illustrations. In every lesson have a point, stick to your point, and make your point. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.10*

The following import resolutions were passed by the association at this and a subsequent meeting: *SITI*

December 1, 1887, page 727.11

WHEREAS, The existence of many of our small churches depends largely upon the interest created by the Sabbath-schools; and, *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.12*

WHEREAS, Experience have shown that where earnest personal labor has been devoted to the schools, by some judicious, practical Sabbath-school worker, the interest has greatly increased; therefore, *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.13*

Resolved, That this association request each State Conference to employ some one of the officers of the Sabbath-school Association within its bounds, to devote the greater part or the whole of his time to building up the interests of the Sabbath-schools. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.14*

WHEREAS, There has been a difference of custom in the different State associations, in the matter of tithing their contributions, some tithing the whole, and others tithing only one-fourth, and it is desirable that there should be uniformity in this matter; therefore, *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.15*

Resolved, That it is the sense of this association that, beginning January, 1888, every Sabbath-school should pay a tithe of all its contributions to the treasury of the State association with which it is connected, and that after paying the necessary running expenses of the school, it should donate the remainder to whatever mission may be recommended. But this resolution shall not be construed as shutting off the members of any school from paying a part or the whole of the running expenses of their school out of their own pockets, leaving all the contributions, less the tithe, to be donated to missions. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.16*

Resolved, That we recommend that all the Sabbath-schools in the association make the London City Mission the recipient of their contributions for the year 1888. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.17*

Resolved, That we recommend to our Executive Committee such a reconstruction of the system of primary lessons as will naturally lead the young mind to a knowledge of God, to our need of a Saviour, and to the compassionate love of God as manifested in the life and mission of Jesus Christ. This to be followed by lessons upon those portions of the Old Testament history which illustrate these all-important themes. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.18*

Resolved, That it is the sense of this association that when ministers being tent-meetings in any locality, they should at once, whenever it is practical, begin a Sunday-school, which shall be continued until it can be converted into a Sabbath-school, and that a short series of lessons on the life of Christ should be prepared for use in such Sunday-school. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.19*

Resolved, That we recommend that our State associations hold Sabbath-school Normals in connection with general meetings and camp-meetings, especially local camp-meetings, for the instruction of officers and teachers in the various branches of the Sabbath-school work; and further, *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.20*

Resolved, That we request our Conference officers to provide opportunity, and to aid in procuring the necessary help, for such conventions. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.21*

WHEREAS, In the providence of God we have in the past year seen a good work opened in South Africa, our workers have enjoyed the divine blessing and favor, and souls are already rejoicing in the truth, and a good prospect seems open for labor there; therefore, *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.22*

Resolved, That we express our sincere gratitude to God, under whose blessing and guidance all true success is attained. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.23*

Resolved, That it is a satisfaction to us, as an association, that we have been permitted to be in a measure instrumental in forwarding this work during the past year, and that we would hereby assure the dead brethren in that far-off land of our continued prayers and interest. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.24*

W. C. White, chairman of the Committee on Lessons, then submitted the following report, which was accepted: - *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.25*

Your committee appointed to consider plans for future lessons recommend for the Senior Division of our schools - *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.26*

1. That we have a series of lessons on Old Testament history, and that about six months, beginning with January, 1888, be devoted to the study of lessons from Genesis. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.27*

2. That the remainder of 1888 be devoted to the study of doctrinal lessons, including the following subjects:

"The United States in Prophecy," and "The Third Angel's Message." *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.28*

3. That the first six months of 1889 be devoted to a continuation of the study of Old Testament history. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.29*

4. That the last six months of 1889 be devoted to the study of doctrinal subjects, selected by the Executive Committee. We also recommend- *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.30*

5. That the lessons for 1888 be written immediately, and, after approval by the Executive Committee, that they be published in two pamphlets, of twenty-six lessons each, for the use of Sabbath-school officers and teachers. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.31*

6. That the lessons for 1888 be written in time to be presented for examination at the next annual meeting of this association. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.32*

7. That there be published a series of fifty-two lessons, on the leading doctrines of the Bible, for the use of those newly come to the faith. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.33*

8. That a series of lessons for little children be prepared on the life of Christ. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.34*

9. That the Executive Committee employ the best talent within their reach for the preparation of these lessons, at as early a date as possible. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.35*

On Monday afternoon, November 21, the second meeting of the International Tract and Missionary Society was held. The principal item of interest at this meeting was the election of officers for the ensuing year. Following is the list of officers with their addresses:- *SITI December 1, 1887, page 727.36*

President, Elder S. N. Haskell, Paternoster Chambers, 48 Paternoster Row, London, England *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.1*

Vice-President, W. C. White, Pacific Press, Oakland, California. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.2*

Secretary and Treasurer, Maria L. Huntley, Healdsburg, California. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.3*

Assistant Secretaries:- *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.4*

Anna L. Ingels, Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.5*

Mrs. F. H. Sisley, Battle Creek, Michigan. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.6*

Jenny Thayer, 451 Holloway Road, Holloway, London N., England. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.7*

H. P. Holser, *Impremerie Polyglotte*, Basel, Switzerland. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.8*

Josie I. Baker, *Bible Echo* Office, Melbourne, Australia. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.9*

Elizabeth Hare, Auckland, New Zealand. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.10*

Mary Heilesen, Christiania, Norway. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.11*

Mrs. C. I. Boyd, Cape Town, South Africa. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.12*

A. Swedberg, Battle Creek, Michigan. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.13*

Executive Board:- *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.14*

S. N. Haskell, W. C. White, O. A. Olsen, A. J. Breed, G. C. Tenney, W. C. Sisley, M. L. Huntley. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.15*

On Tuesday, November 22, there were two meetings of the General Conference, at which the following recommendations of the Committee on Distribution of Labor were adopted:- *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.16*

That we recognize the good services of Brother A. La Rue in the ship missionary work on the Pacific Ocean and its islands, and recommend that he continue the same. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.17*

That Brother H. P. Holser go to Central Europe to act as Treasurer of the mission and publishing house, and

to take charge of the book sales department and the counting-room; to teach canvassers, colporters, and Bible workers; and to help the German work in the field as he may have opportunity. Also to act on the mission board as alternate in the absence of Elder R. L. Whitney.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.18*

That Brother A. Barry, of Kentucky, go to Michigan to labor in that Conference.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.19*

That D. A. Robinson go to London to labor in that mission.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.20*

That Elder I. J. Hankins go to South Africa, to take the place in the mission there made vacant by the removal of Elder D. A. Robinson.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.21*

That William Arnold go to England to help in establishing the mission there.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.22*

That Elder John Fulton and wife be requested to spend a year at the Rural Health Retreat, at St. Helena, Cal.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.23*

That Elder Samuel Fulton take the place in the North Pacific Conference made vacant by the removal of John Fulton to St. Helena.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.24*

That Elder D. T. Bourdeau go to New Orleans and spend the winter in labor in that city.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.25*

The committee to whom the matter of a missionary ship was referred, have reported as follows:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.26*

Your committee appointed to consider the matter of securing a ship for missionary work among the islands of the sea, would respectfully submit the following:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.27*

We believe that such a ship is needed; we deem the enterprise a noble one, and well worthy the hearty support of all our people; but in view of the fact that some of our missions are now in actual distress, for the means which they *must have* to do the work properly which must be done;*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.28*

In view of the fact that the International Sabbath-school Association has devoted its contributions for 1888 to the London Mission, and we think it would be most profitable to our people to have all concerned in the missionary ship when it is decided upon,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.29*

We therefore recommend that the enterprise of setting afloat a missionary ship be postponed till the next annual session of the General Conference.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.30*

We would further recommend that a committee of five, consisting of three brethren from east of the Rocky Mountains, and two from the Pacific Coast, be appointed to take charge of this matter during the year 1888, and report to the next annual session of this Conference. And further, that donations to this enterprise may be received during the year, from any who feel disposed to make such donations.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.31*

Following are the principal resolutions passed in the meeting of the Health Reform Association:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.32*

Resolved, That we see reason for devout gratitude to God that the efforts made in our various Conferences the past year to awaken a deeper interest in the cause of health and temperance, have met with such marked success, the tangible evidence of which is apparent in the greatly increased number of subscribers to *Good Health*, and the sale of so many thousands of health and temperance publications.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.33*

Resolved, That we hail with delight the news which comes to us through our representatives from Scandinavia, that the Danish-Norwegian and Swedish health journals are so rapidly increasing their lists of subscribers through the efforts of canvassers, and that by this means our workers are gaining access to so many homes and hearts in those countries.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.34*

Resolved, That we consider the cause of health reform as one the world over, and that we extend the hand of sympathy and good cheer to the Rural Health Retreat, at St. Helena, California, in which is inculcated the same principles as in the Sanitarium at Battle Creek, Michigan, and that we are greatly pleased to learn of the progress which the former institution has made since its opening in the spring of 1885.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.35*

WHEREAS, The Health Retreat, though desirous to do all it can in giving charity treatment to the sick and worthy poor among us, cannot, while in its comparative infancy, do as is proposed by the parent Sanitarium, erect a charity hospital; therefore,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.36*

Resolved, That in the sense of this body, it should be aided in its humanitarian work by raising a charity fund to be used for the benefit of the afflicted poor who shall be properly recommended to the care of the institution, such fund to be called for in contributions from those inclined to give for so worthy an object.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.37*

WHEREAS, The two journals,*Good Health* and *Pacific Health Journal*, have each their mission to fill, and their appropriate sphere in which to work, the former being like an advanced reader and the latter a primer of simplified lessons; therefore,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.38*

Resolved, That we deem it expedient that the circulation of both these journals be encouraged as a means of arousing investigation of, and stimulating perseverance in, the cause of health reform.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.39*

At a meeting of the International Tract Society, the following resolutions of approval of our papers were passed:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.40*

WHEREAS, The SIGNS OF THE TIMES is our pioneer missionary journal, and finds favor with the people while it conveys to them the principles of the Third Angel's Message; therefore,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.41*

Resolved, That we recommend to State Tract and Missionary Societies to take as large clubs as they can use to advantage, and that we urge all ministers, colporters, and the members of local missionary societies, to make constant and strenuous effort to place the paper in the hands of the people.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.42*

WHEREAS, The rapid growth of the National Reform Association, and its widespread evil influences, show how dangerously near it is to assured success; and,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.43*

WHEREAS, We know the destructive consequences that will surely attend the success of that movement; and,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.44*

WHEREAS, The *American Sentinel* is devoted to the work of exposing the evil that lurks in that movement; therefore,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.45*

Resolved, That we deem it to be the duty of our State and local societies, ministers, missionary workers and our people generally, to bring the *Sentinel* to the attention of all classes of people, but particularly to lawyers, legislators, and other men of public affairs.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.46*

Concerning the matter of the first resolution, Sister White related the circumstances under which the SIGNS was started, and why it was started. She stated that it has a work to do that no other paper can accomplish. The *Review and Herald*, which is a church paper, should be taken and read by every church member; but the SIGNS OF THE TIMES is a missionary journal, and should go to every part of the world. She stated that our people could not get along without either one of these papers, but that every family should have them both.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.47*

Concerning the *Sentinel*, it was stated that the publishers hoped to see the circulation increased to 500,000 copies during the year 1888. For the year 1887 there has been printed to total of 255,000 copies, which is nearly double the number printed during the previous year. One man, a total stranger to us and to our work, got hold of one copy of the *Sentinel*, and wrote to the office ordering nineteen copies of the November number to be sent to as many different addresses.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.48*

Thursday forenoon, November 24, a meeting of the Seventh-day Adventist Educational Society was held. This is the Battle Creek College Association, having no jurisdiction over other schools or colleges of the denomination. The following resolutions, which were adopted, will give the best idea of the work done:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.49*

Resolved, That the increased facilities afforded by our College are a source of renewed gratitude to God, and this action of the managers of the institution deserves our hearty approval.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.50*

Resolved, That we appreciate the efforts of the managers of the College to place it in a condition to better fulfill the object of its establishment, and pledge ourselves, and ask our people, to sustain our Trustees in their

laudable efforts thus far made.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.51*

WHEREAS, Efforts have been made by the managers of Battle Creek College and of our other educational institutions to organize a system of manual training in connection with these schools; and,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.52*

WHEREAS, We regard this effort as being in harmony with the will of God in relation to these institutions, as well as in harmony with the conclusion reached by the most advanced scientific educators of the age; therefore,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.53*

Resolved, That we express our approval of the efforts which have been made, and of the results which have already been attained, and urge that these efforts be continued in the same direction, and that advance steps be made as rapidly as experience and the development of this line of educational work may indicate as necessary; and,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.54*

WHEREAS, There is general ignorance, and, on the part of many, an entire misconception of the aims and purposes of manual training in the education of the youth; therefore,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.55*

Resolved, That the Trustees be requested to prepare for general circulation a pamphlet on this subject; and,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.56*

Resolved, That when this pamphlet is prepared, the Trustees of this society shall make an effort to place a copy in the hands of every Sabbath-keeping family.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.57*

WHEREAS, In some cases students, parents, and guardians feel a little inimical to the plan of working a portion of the time, either in domestic affairs or at some trade; and,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.58*

WHEREAS, Its object is to better fit all students for the ordinary duties of life as well as the highest Christian culture; and,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.59*

WHEREAS, This object can be attained in no better way; therefore,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.60*

Resolved, That we entreat all our people and the students that may come to the institution to try to realize the great benefit to be derived from the manual training department, and encourage the good work by every proper means.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.61*

WHEREAS, We recognize a healthy condition of the body as essential to the best mental and moral development; and,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.62*

WHEREAS, It is a recognized fact that a large share of the causes which occasion disease and premature decay of the physical powers in adults originate in childhood and youth,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.63*

Resolved, That we urge upon the managers of all our educational institutions the importance of giving special attention to the physical training of students under their charge, and that it be considered the duty of managers and teachers to secure as far as possible an improvement in the health and physical condition of the students as well as in their mental and moral conditions.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.64*

Resolved, That the study of health and temperance principles and of hygiene as held among us should be introduced into all our schools and made compulsory upon all students pursuing a regular course of study and who are not already proficient in these branches.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.65*

WHEREAS, Many of our people are located at long distances from any of our denominational schools, involving large expense in sending children to enjoy the advantages of these schools; and,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.66*

WHEREAS, It is evidently unwise for parents to send young children away from their care, even though it be to our schools; therefore,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.67*

Resolved, That we favor the establishment of local or church schools for the purpose of teaching the common branches, and that we recommend the managers of the College to give special attention to the training of teachers for such schools.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.68*

The remaining items of interest will be given on the last page.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.69*

The Committee on Distribution of Labor made the following additional recommendations at the last meetings, which were adopted:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.70*

That Russel Hart, of Battle Creek, Mich., go to Norway to assist in the Publishing house in Christiania for a year or so, until efficient help be educated.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.71*

That Sister Carrie Mills go to Portland to take a position in the school and Bible work.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.72*

That Elder Oscar Hill and wife go to Alabama and Mississippi to labor.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.73*

That furnishing labor to the Pacific islands be referred to the General Conference Committee, with the recommendation that someone be selected to supply the urgent wants of that field.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.74*

The twenty-sixth annual session of the General Conference practically closed at midnight, November 27, although the last meeting, which closed at that hour, adjourned to Saturday evening, December 3, when some special matters will be discussed. The Conference session has been a most enjoyable season to the members of the Oakland church, who have felt it a rich treat to have the privilege of entertaining our good brethren and sisters from the East, and in listening to the proceedings of the various societies. The weather throughout has been most favorable for the meetings, no ran having yet fallen. The deliberations of the Conference and other associations were characterized by great harmony and good feeling, and the discussion on the various points that were considered demonstrated the fact that men may differ in opinion and still retain brotherly love for one another. We believe that the holding of the General Conference in California this year will prove to have been a wise move. We trust that, aside from the measures decided upon in the session, lasting good may accrue, not only to the California Conference, but to all the Conferences that were represented.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.75*

The following important resolutions were passed at the General Conference:*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.76*

WHEREAS, Our growing publishing interests in different parts of the world are one in purpose, and should ever be united in action; therefore,*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.77*

Resolved, That this Conference appoint a standing committee of thirteen persons for the coming year, to be known as the Book Committee, whose duty it shall be to labor for the improvement and wider circulation of our denominational literature.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.78*

Resolved, That it shall be the duty of this committee to hold a meeting in the spring and another in the autumn of the year, at the most convenient place for the majority of the committee to meet.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.79*

Resolved, That questions as to the necessity of establishing new printing offices, the duties and privileges of the smaller offices now in operation, and all questions that may arise between our publishing associations or general agents, shall be referred to this committee, whose decisions, after receiving the approval of a majority of the General Conference Committee, shall be considered as the voice of this body.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.80*

This committee, as elected for the coming year, is composed of the following persons: Geo. I. Butler, U. Smith, W. C. White, J. H. Kellogg, C. Eldridge, F. E. Belden, C. H. Jones, E. J. Waggoner, E. M. Morrison, J. G. Matteson, F. W. Farnsworth, R. M. Kilgore, A. T. Robinson.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 728.81*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

According to the credentials and licenses issued, there will be fifty-seven General Conference laborers in the field next year.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.1*

It is the unanimous opinion of the religious papers of the East that the action of the Personal Liberty League in demanding open saloons on Sunday afternoons, has stirred the people in New York and Pennsylvania "as never before." And with every stir the National Sunday-law movement is increased in power and influence.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.2*

At the last meeting of the Conference the question was raised as to where the next session should be held. There was quite a lively competition over the matter, several States being anxious for the privilege of entertaining the delegates. After many propositions, and much discussion, it was finally voted to hold the next session at South Lancaster, Mass.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.3*

Considerable space in this number of the SIGNS is devoted to the General Conference, but we do not believe that our readers will complain of this. The matter which we present is of general interest, and may be read with profit by all. There is, however, besides the Conference business, a large amount of interesting and valuable matter on Bible subjects; as much, perhaps, as the ordinary reader can well digest before the next issues of the paper.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.4*

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union has decided to make it a special point in their public and private prayers, to pray that the 54,000 preachers in this country "may all become total abstainers and advocates of prohibition." It is a most pitiable thing that there should be any room, and much more that there should be any need, for such prayers. Think of its being necessary to pray in private and in public, that the preachers of the gospel should practice the principles which they profess to preach.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.5*

The managers of the Chautauqua studies have done themselves honor and the public untold good by placing upon their list of studies for the present class-year the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation." We heartily commend this action of the Chautauqua managers, and congratulate the students. The use and influence of that book can never be anything but an unmixed good. We wish it might be studied in every home in the nation, or in the world for that matter. We are glad of the increased circulation that will be given to the book and to its sublime philosophy through the work of the Chautauqua circles. The book has been issued in a new edition and smaller size, and is sold at the low price of *sixty cents*. It can be had at the Pacific Press, this city.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.6*

Thanksgiving-day has come and gone. It was no doubt observed throughout the country as well as is usual on this annual occasion. The churches assembled in their usual places of worship, and gave thanks to God, and worshipped him from whom all blessings flow. The saloons got in their evil work, and did a flourishing business all day. Games, excursions, and festivities of all kinds went on with great *elat*. In San Francisco alone, 45,000 people attended the base-ball games. Yet with all this increased saloon traffic, and playing of games, and running to and fro, on this day specially appointed for worship and thanksgiving to God, we have heard not the slightest complaint of anybody's worship being disturbed; while on Sundays there is not nearly so much of this noise, drunkenness, and festivity, and yet the complaints are almost universal from the leaders in the churches, that their worship is most sorely disturbed. Now why is this? Why is it that with all these things nobody's worship is disturbed on Thanksgiving-day, while with not nearly so much of it on Sunday so many people's worship is so much disturbed? Why is it that that which so greatly "disturbs" people's worship on one day has no tendency at all in that direction on another day? We wish that somebody whose worship is disturbed on Sunday would enlighten us on this point. We have no idea, however, that any such will do it. The fact is that it is not at all Sunday worship, but is solely the Sunday *doctrine* that is disturbed. If the Sunday doctrine had any support in the word of God, there would be no complaints of disturbance of Sunday worship.*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.7*

"Where They Draw the Line" The Signs of the Times, 13, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

The New York *Observer*, in commenting on the Personal Liberty League Sunday contest, says that the League "has undoubtedly secured enough representatives of its kind to make it certain that an attempt will be made to have a law enacted in accordance with its wishes, that is, a law opening the saloons, museums, and concert gardens on the Sabbath." Yet the *Observer* thinks the League will not succeed in getting such a law, because there are so many who, although they have no regard for Sunday as a religious institution, are "quick to come to the defense of the day when its existence is threatened by the rum power." And then it confesses the very thing which we have often pointed out, that is, that is not the solution itself, but only the *Sunday* saloon that is opposed. The *Observer* says"-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.8*

"Many have said, in effect, that they will bear any thing from the saloon but this, the giving up of the Sabbath [Sunday]. They draw the line at that."*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.9*

Yes, they will bear anything from the saloon but this. They will bear the drunkenness, the murdering, the woe, the ruin, the devastation, and the universal devilry generally wrought by the saloon. They will bear it day and night, year in and year out, they will bear it without a murmur or a word of objection or complaint. In the estimation of these people all these evils can be carried on entirely consistently with the principles of civil and moral right. But if the saloon shall attempt to carry on its work on Sunday, then the saloon, which is all right all other days, suddenly becomes a thing laden with iniquity, and totally unworthy of any place in the world-till Sunday is passed. With all this the opinion of the *Independent* also chimes. It says:-*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.10*

"The people of this country want a quiet and orderly Sabbath [Sunday], and in order to have it they must shut up the grogeries."*SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.11*

But they don't propose to shut up the groggeries except on Sunday. "They will draw the line at that." But why? Why? Why do they not draw the line at the *right* point of no solution at all? Ah! they want the saloon and Sunday too, and it is a very worthy companionship. *SITI December 1, 1887, page 736.12*

December 8, 1887

"The Spirit of Antichrist. No. 3" The Signs of the Times, 13, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

We shall now proceed to show that the teaching of the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul, has from the very beginning been accompanied by sin, and that it is the cause of all the sin that has ever cursed this earth. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.1*

When God placed our first parents in Eden, everything was perfect and pure. Adam and Eve were sinless. They had full liberty to enjoy the fruit of every tree that was pleasant to the sight and good for food, with the exception of one tree in the midst of the garden, which was a test of their loyalty to God. Into this garden of delight the tempter came. "Now the serpent ["which is the devil, and Satan," *Revelation 20:2*] was more subtil than any beast of the field, the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" *Genesis 3:1*. In this question we find a covert insinuation against the justice of God. The idea is this: "Is it so, that God has said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? Has God been so arbitrary as to thus curtail your happiness?" There was an attempt to make Eve feel that she was being wronged, in being deprived of the fruit of that tree, and that she was not treated with the consideration due to so noble a creature. She replied that God had said that they should not eat of the tree, nor touch it, lest they die. Satan then replied: *-SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.2*

"Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." *Genesis 3:4, 5. SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.3*

It is unfortunate for the advocates of the natural immortality of the soul, that the very first announcement of it that was ever made was made by the father of lies. We have already demonstrated from the Scriptures that the teaching that man can have immortality without Christ is the spirit of antichrist, and here we find that the doctrine was introduced into the world by the very antichrist himself. If we study Satan's words a little more closely we shall find that they were identical with the teachings of modern Spiritualism, and that the first Spiritualist lecture ever delivered was given by the devil in the garden of Eden, with only Eve for an audience. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.4*

When Satan affirmed that Adam and Eve were by nature immortal, by saying, "Ye shall not surely die," he added, "For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." This was as much of a lie as the other, and was a companion to it, and a necessary consequence of it. Our common version does not give the full force of the original. We know not why the translators rendered it, "Ye shall be as gods," for the Hebrew plainly reads, "Ye shall be *like* God, knowing good and evil." This lets in new light on the subject. It shows that Satan recognized the fact that immortality is an attribute of Deity, and that the possessor of it must necessarily be his own judge of right and wrong. It was by this lie that Satan deceived Eve, and caused her to sin. Notice that the assertion of immortality and of the power of judging for themselves of right and wrong, constitutes the one deception; and bear in mind that it was this claim of natural immortality for man which "brought death into the world, and all our woe, with loss of Eden." Therefore we have proved the proposition that the doctrine of the natural immortality of man is the cause of all the wickedness that has ever cursed our earth. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.5*

We may go back even further than this, to the time when sin first entered the universe, and we shall find that the cause of it was pride, and the claiming of attributes that belong to God alone. In *Isaiah 14:12-14* we read the following description of the fall of Satan: *-SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.6*

"How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High." *SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.7*

This gives in plain language the sin of Satan. He aspired to be equal with God; he coveted the position that belonged only to the divine Word the Son of God; and there the spirit of antichrist first sprung into existence. Turn now to *Ezekiel 28:11-19*, and read a description of Satan's former position in Heaven, and the cause of his fall. Satan here appears with the title, "King of Tyrus." He is so called because he is "the god of this world" (*2 Corinthians 4:4*), and the one who actually holds the reins of power in all wicked governments, such as that of Tyre. The man who held the position of the king of Tyre is in the prophecy called "the prince of Tyrus" (*Ezekiel 28:1-10*), because he was secondary to Satan, who controlled him. Moreover it is certain that *verses 13-15* could refer to no one but one who had been in Heaven. Now read the description: *-SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.8*

"Moreover the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, take up a lamentation upon the king of Tyrus, and say unto him, Thus saith the Lord God; Thou sealest up the sum, full of wisdom, and perfect in beauty. Thou hast been in Eden the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering, the sardius, topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper, the sapphire, and the carbuncle, and gold; the workmanship of thy tabrets and of thy pipes was prepared in thee in the day that thou wast created. Thou art the anointed cherub that covereth; and I have set thee so; thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire. Thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created, till iniquity was found in thee. By the multitude of thy merchandise they have filled the midst of thee with violence, and thou hast sinned; therefore I will cast thee as profane out of the mountain of God; and I will destroy thee, O covering cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire. Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty, thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy brightness; I will cast thee to the ground, I will lay thee before kings, that they may behold thee. Thou hast defiled thy sanctuaries by the multitude of thine iniquities, by the iniquity of thy traffic; therefore will I bring forth a fire from the midst of thee, it shall devour thee, and I will bring thee to ashes upon the earth in the sight of all them that behold thee. All they that know thee among the people shall be astonished at thee; thou shalt be a terror, and never shalt thou be any more." *SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.9*

Thus we learn that pride, and undue regard for self, forgetfulness of the fact that no one can have anything except from God, and is a desire to be equal, in some respects at least, to God, led to Satan's fall. And this cause of his fall was exactly the same in nature as that by which he fell; and it is the identical principle by which Satan has perpetuated sin in the world until the present time. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.10*

From the fall of our first parents, every great system of error has been based upon that first great falsehood uttered by Satan. How natural that it should be so! Error is simply a departure from God, a failure or refusal to acknowledge him as of supreme authority. But just in proportion as men fail to recognize the claims of God, they usurp the place which he should occupy. That is, to the extent that they neglect God, they follow their own ways, and thus to that extent they make themselves gods, and worship themselves. But, as we have already seen, the claim that man is immortal is also a claim that he is a god. Thus the two things go together. The doctrine of natural immortality, being a gross error, leads to the commission of the sins which are natural to man. It was the first cause of sin. But if there should be a people who had no belief of any kind concerning man's nature and his future condition, but who were following their own inclinations, they would soon develop the idea that they were immortal. And this would be because pride, which is *always* present in the natural heart, would lead man to feel that there could be no being in the universe greater than himself. As Gibbon aptly expresses it ("Decline and Fall," chap. 1.), "it must be confessed that in the sublime inquiry [concerning the nature of man], their reason had often been guided by their imagination, and their imagination had been prompted by their vanity. When they viewed with complacency the extent of their own mental powers, when they exercised the various faculties of memory, of fancy, and of judgment, in the most profound speculations, or the most important labors, and when they reflected on the desire of fame, which transported them into future ages, far beyond the bounds of death and of the grave, they were unwilling to confound themselves with the beasts of the field, or to suppose that a being for whose dignity they entertained the most sincere admiration, could be limited to a spot of earth, and to a few years of duration." And so dead man would be deified. *W.SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.11*

"The Link Is Still Missing" The Signs of the Times, 13, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

A very zealous defender of the first-day sabbath has unearthed the following. It is not new, but it is just as good as new, for its extreme thinness has hindered its being used very much:- *SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.12*

"Consider a few facts as to why the Jewish Christians did not immediately give up the observance of the seventh day. How carefully and gradually Jesus unfolded his new doctrines, even to the chosen apostles. To the multitudes he spoke only in parables, 'as they were able to hear it.' *Mark 4:33*. Had Jesus at once and plainly told the people the radical change which he had come to make in the Jewish system of worship, they would have killed him immediately. Even the apostles would have been horrified, and doubtless would all have left him. During all the ministry of our Lord, nothing stands out more prominently than the fact that he was gradually but cautiously preparing the minds of his disciples for the great change which his gospel was destined to make in the worship of God.... Just before Jesus died, he said: 'I have yet many things to say and to you, but he cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth.' *John 16:12, 13.*" *SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.13*

Well, now, what a pity that, after spending the three years and a half of his ministry in "cautiously preparing the minds of his disciples for the great change which his gospel was destined to make in the worship of God," he did not once even so much as intimate to them what that change was to be! Surely this was an excess of

caution. True, indeed, he spoke to the multitude in parables, but to his own disciples he spoke plainly. Many things he said to them that would not have been listened to by the mass of the Jews. But he gave his disciples the following commands and exhortation, which would insure that everything that he said should have the widest publicity:-*SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.14*

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." *Matthew 28:19, 20.SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.15*

"If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household? Fear them not therefore; for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and hid, that shall not be known. What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops." *Matthew 10:25-27.SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.16*

It is certain that the disciples followed this counsel, for but a few weeks after the resurrection, Peter stood before the entire Jewish Sanhedrim, and boldly charged those men with the murder of Jesus. When threatened with imprisonment and stripes, the apostles plainly told the Jews that they should pay no attention to their commands not to preach, but should obey God rather than men. And that they did proclaim all that they had learned of Jesus, is shown by the words of Paul, who, like the rest, had seen the Lord and learned of him. To the Ephesian elders he said: "I kept back nothing that was profitable until you;" "wherefore I take you to record this day, that I impure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." *Acts 20:20, 26, 27.* This he did in the face of death, showing that he was not deterred by fear, yet never a word did he say about the change of the Sabbath. Why this silence on so important a subject?*SITI December 8, 1887, page 742.17*

If anything more were needed to show that a disregard for the law of God is always accompanied by a low estimate of Christ's character and work, it is shown in the statement that Christ refrained from telling the Jews about the change of the Sabbath, for fear that they would kill him. Such a base charge could not be made except by one whose disregard for the law has blunted at all his finer sensibilities. The idea that Jesus, who came to earth for the express purpose of giving his life for man, should, through fear of man, keep back part of his message, is too absurd for sober comment. Read the eighth chapter of John, and learn how he called the Jews liars and murderers, and charged them with being children of the devil; read the denunciations in the twenty-third chapter of Matthew, and then try to imagine him cowering before their hard looks, to the extent that he would not tell them necessary truth. Such an imputation indicates that the one making it regards Christ as less than man.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 743.1*

It is indeed true that Christ said that he had many things to say which the disciples could not then bear; but if the change of the Sabbath was one of those things, how does it happen that the Holy Spirit did not reveal it, so that it could appear in some of the writings of the apostles? Is it claimed that the Holy Spirit did gradually lead the church into Sunday-keeping? Where's the proof? If the church was gradually led to that practice, it must be that at first only a very few were led to that practice. Where are their credentials? What have they to show that *they* were led by the Spirit more than others? Nothing but their own assertion, even as "the church" can give nothing but its own assertion to show that it is led by the Spirit in its practice of Sunday-keeping. But if we are to believe every man who claims to be led by the Spirit, we shall have to accept all the errors that flood the earth. No, we will "try the spirits, whether they are of God," and we can try them by nothing except the law and the testimony.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 743.2*

It would seem as though the frantic efforts of the Sunday advocates to find something to support their cause, ought in itself to be sufficient to show thinking persons its inherent weakness. Never did evolutionists search more eagerly for the "missing link" than do the advocates for Sunday for some direct evidence to show that the Sabbath has been changed from the seventh to the first day of the week. They leave no doubt but that the change was made, only both Jesus and his apostles neglected to say anything about it. We appeal to candid people, who desire to know and obey the truth, if the fact that the Bible nowhere mentions the change of the Sabbath, nor intimates that any change was made, nor commands anybody to keep the first day of the week, is not sufficient evidence that the Sabbath never was changed by divine authority, and that the Lord did not design that anybody should ever keep the first day of the week. Shall we be Bible Christians? If not, can we be Christians at all? *W.SITI December 8, 1887, page 743.3*

"General Review" The Signs of the Times, 13, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

There being no set lesson for this date, we present a few fragmentary notes on certain portions of the lessons that have been studied during the quarter. Some of the first lessons were records of notable miracles performed by Jesus. These were performed in response to faith exercised by the individual, and should serve

to direct our minds to the power of faith. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews gives a list of things that have been done through faith, and the inquiry might naturally arise, Whence does faith derive this extraordinary power? The answer will be found in an examination of what faith is, which we can give only in the briefest manner. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 746.1*

Faith is confidence in another. It is a giving up of one's own ideas and will, to some other who is thereby acknowledged to be superior. It is trust, such as the innocent child reposes in its parents' word. Now anybody knows that whenever such confidence is reposed in any person, it always produces a certain degree of consideration for, or tenderness toward, the trusting one. The traveler who is appealed to for guidance by a fellow-traveler, feels an interest in that other; the fact that a stranger has confided in him makes him feel kindly toward the unknown one. Even the hardened ruffian could scarcely find it in his heart to do harm to one who, trusting to his honor, would unhesitatingly cast himself upon him for protection. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 746.2*

Now whatever good things there are in man, are from above, and exist in the heart of God as much more strongly than in the heart of man, as God is greater than man. So when Abraham, with child-like trust, believed God when he made a promise which to all human appearances could never be accomplished, his simple belief "was counted unto him for righteousness." It is not irreverent for us to say that such trust touched the heart of God, and made him feel especially tender toward Abraham. Faith accomplished what nothing else could. And let it be remembered that there is good reason for this. Perfect faith implies perfect worship. Faith and humility are inseparable. The greater one's faith in another, the lower his opinion of himself. So that perfect faith in God, such as Abraham exhibited, implied perfect willingness to do whatever God required of him. Such faith is as powerful to-day as it ever was. It suffices to secure pardon for sin, even as it did for Abraham, and nothing but such faith will secure pardon. The cleansing of a sinner from the defilement of sin is the greatest of all miracles, and it is one that is daily being performed in response to faith. Whenever God sees such trust and submission in the heart of anyone, nothing that that one can ask for can be denied. Then who would not pray, "Lord, increase our faith"? *SITI December 8, 1887, page 746.3*

Jesus said to his disciples, on one occasion, "Truly the harvest is plenteous, but the laborers are few." This suggests the query, Who are the laborers? and how do they stand related to the work of Christ? Their relation to Christ is most intimate. Christ is the great source of light. "In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," and "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." His disciples derive the light from him, and are, in turn, to be the light of the world. See *Matthew 5:14*. Thus they are sharers in Christ's work. He himself said to the Father: "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." *John 17:18*. Thus the disciples become "workers together with God," and prepared, by the only means possible, to receive the cheering words, "Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." Only those who are sharers in Christ's work can be partakers of his joy. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 746.4*

The lesson for November 20 is a most important one. In it occurs these words: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." *Matthew 11:28-30*. There is no freedom outside of Christ. The Christian is the only man on earth who really has his liberty. Sin and lawlessness are a grievous yoke of bondage, and Christ alone can break this yoke from off our necks. Anarchists fight against all law; they feel that something is galling their necks, and they imagine that it is the law, and so they would fain abolish law. But that which galls them is the yoke of sin which they bear. The law of God in Christ Jesus is not a grievous yoke. There is no man so much at liberty as the one who keeps the law of God, and this can be kept only when one is in Christ. The one who perfectly obeys the law never feels it. Said the psalmist: "I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts." *Psalms 119:45*. And our Saviour set forth the whole matter in the following words: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." *John 8:34-36*. Before this he had said: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Verse 32. This agrees with the other, for Christ is the truth. *John 14:6. SITI December 8, 1887, page 746.5*

The parables in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew seem to be the most expressive of any in the Bible. The parable of the tares utterly refutes the comparatively modern idea of a temporal millennium. In the parable, the man who owned the field is represented as saying to his servants who asked if they should not pull up the tares: "Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest; and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." *SITI December 8, 1887, page 746.6*

In the interpretation of the parable, the field is declared to be the world, the good seed the children of the kingdom, the tares the children of the devil; the harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels. The Saviour then says: "As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all

things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear." *Matthew 13:40-43*. This declaration is so plain that no comment can make it plainer. It shows conclusively that there is never on this earth a time of righteousness and peace until the wicked have been destroyed, and that the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous do not take place until the coming of Christ and the end of the world. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 747.1*

The parable of the net that was cast into the sea (*Matthew 13:47-49*) seems to be of a little different nature from that of the wheat and tares. There would be no object in giving two parables in close connection, to teach exactly the same thing. In this chapter many parables are given illustrative of the kingdom of Heaven, because all its features could not possibly be represented in one parable. The parable of the net is, we think, more limited in its application than the parable of the tares and the wheat. The latter represents the good and bad as living together in the world until the final Judgment; the former represents both good and bad persons as being taken into the church, and remaining there until they shall be separated by the decisions of the Judgment. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 747.2*

Notice that in this parable there is first a gathering out from the sea, which doubtless represents the world. Into the net are gathered a quantity of fishes out from the great mass of fishes. The net contains both bad and good. When it is drawn ashore, the catch is sorted, the good being preserved, and the bad thrown away. Even "so shall it be at the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; then shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." The company here brought to view by the fishes in the net is a company of supposed good people, of those whom it is proper to expect that they will be good. The church is just such a company. According to their profession, all the members of the church ought to be good; but they are not. Many that say, "Lord, Lord," will be cast out at the last day. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 747.3*

No one has any reason to feel safe, simply because his name is on the church roll. The gospel net gathers in both bad and good. This does not mean that any of those whom it gathers in are good in the sense that they are fit for translation, but that they are composed of good material out of which to make saints. The work of the gospel, after it has gathered them out, is to transform them fully into the divine image. But some are bad; they will not be transformed; they resist the good influences that are cast around them, and so grow worse instead of better. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 747.4*

This parable takes all the point out of the infidel cavils concerning church members who act dishonestly or who fall into gross immorality. Christ has told us beforehand that there will be false professors. Therefore there is no point to the cavil that infidels love to make against religion, when some professors show that they are unsanctified in life. We learn that both bad and good are drawn into the gospel net. The church is Christ's school, and Christians are learners of Christ, striving to follow the divine pattern, until at last they may come "unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Who has any right to say that the church is a failure, because it contains some dull scholars, and some who refuse to perform their allotted tasks? We judge a school and a teacher, not by the dull, the lazy, or the obstinate pupils, but by those who follow the instruction given them. If those who obey orders show improvement, we say that the school is a good one, and the teacher competent; and we do not pass sentence of condemnation because those who refuse to obey are not benefited. So we must judge of the church of Christ and of Christianity, not by the lives of false professors, but by the lives of those who heed the example and teachings of Christ, and who yield themselves to the influence of the Holy Spirit. *W. SITI December 8, 1887, page 747.5*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

December 31 is the day of the Pope's jubilee. Great preparations are being made for the celebrations on that day and forward, as long as there is anything to be made out of it. On that day he is to receive "the members of the international committees," who will make him a present of 1,000,000 *lire*-\$51,813.47. On January 4 and 5 he will receive the deputations from foreign countries, who will offer three presents. The United States and Canada send \$200,000. January 6 the jubilee presents will be exhibited, and January 15 the Pope will make ten new Catholic saints. *SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.1*

In the *New Thought* of November 26, Prof. J. S. Loveland says:-*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.2*

"Nothing more clearly proves the mighty power of modern Spiritualism than the numerous methods in which it is and has been assailed. Open, direct assault has always resulted in victory for it, and defeat to its enemies. But when the assailants have been within the ranks, the result has been far different. The crusade, started some years since, on the plea of morality, against alleged free-love, has done more than all other things combined to cripple the Spiritualistic movement." *SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.3*

This, coming from a Spiritualist, is a damaging admission. If it is true that the crusade against free-love gave Spiritualism a check, it must be that Spiritualism thrives best in a free-love soil. What conclusion, then, must we draw from the fact that Spiritualism is at the present time making very rapid progress?*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.4*

Although there are no public meetings of the Conference the last week, it was a busy week for the delegates. There was a vast amount of committee work to be done, and this occupied the time of many of the delegates almost constantly night and day. Quite a large number made a trip to the College, at Healdsburg, and the Rural Health Retreat, at St. Helena, having a most enjoyable trip, while they were becoming better acquainted with our work on the coast. We very much desired to have our Eastern friends take this trip, that they might appreciate the situation here, and be able to aid us by their counsel. On the evening of the 3rd there was a meeting of the Conference, to attend to some unfinished business. Our relation to Sunday laws was the principal question of the evening, and a good-sized audience listened attentively to the discussion, which continued to a late hour. Immediately following this there was a final meeting of the Missionary Society. The body adjourned *sine die* about midnight. Some further details will be given later.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.5*

And now the delegates have all, with few exceptions, returned to their respective fields of labor. Sunday morning about a car load left, and Monday morning two cars were filled. Others had found it necessary to leave immediately after the practical adjournment one week previous. Thus has closed a most interesting and profitable session of the General Conference. If the work planned at this gathering shall be prosecuted with earnestness and faithfulness, we believe that a long step in advance will be seen all along the line.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.6*

Not by any means the least important thing gained by this Conference is the strengthening of the ties that bind the different fields of labor together. We believe that all the delegates feel more than ever before that the work is one, that natural divisions, as oceans and mountain chains, cannot make divisions among those who are laboring in the cause of God, and that since we are all laboring in one common cause, our various interests are all one. As for the Oakland church, it has enjoyed a rare privilege in entertaining our brethren and sisters from the East, and in thus becoming intimately acquainted with them. We part from them with sincere regret; our prayers follow them as they journey to their homes. And as we resume our accustomed labors, feeling added responsibilities as a consequence of this meeting, we are strengthened with the belief that our brethren are praying for our success, as we are for theirs. Prayers for the success of the general work will be more intelligently offered now than ever before.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.7*

A short time ago, among other instances of a like nature, we mentioned the case of Jacob Sharp, the New York briber, how it had been carried up from court to court on appeal after appeal, until it had reached the Court of Appeals, and how preparations were being made to carry it to the United States Supreme Court if the Court of Appeals has rendered its decision, and it reverses all the decisions and actions of the courts below, in the case. The old criminal now walks out of jail on \$40,000 bail, to appear, perhaps, sometime for a new trial, when the whole process must be gone through with again. And all this because he has money enough to warp his wicked way through the courts of the State, and exhaust the course of legal procedure. All that a man has to do now is only to be sure that he steals enough to enable him to follow this process and he is safe. Law now is only applicable to the poor; it is but the plaything of the rich. These things cannot long continue so; at this rate the whole fabric of civil society must soon fall.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.8*

The *Interior* says:-*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.9*

"When George Washington was presented with his little hatchet, his fingers ached to cut something with it. It is admitted that George was a good little boy, and meant no harm by chopping down the cherry tree. It has been so ever since. When power is put into an American parvenu's hands-and we are all parvenus in this country, more or less-his fingers burn to exercise it, and if there is no useful work in sight he is sure to do mischief-and is very liable to anyway. If he has the self-confidence of the combined egotism and inexperience, he is irrepressible in his ugliness of purpose."*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.10*

This is just the position we take with reference to the National Reformers. There are very many good people among them. There are many well-meaning persons who are anxious to see laws enacted for the better observance of Sunday. They say that they do not wish to infringe in the least upon the rights of those who keep the seventh day, and we give them credit for honesty of purpose. But they don't know what they would do if they had the power. As the boy who has a brand new, sharp knife, cannot rest content until he has tried its edge, so the man who comes into the possession of power to which he is unaccustomed, must needs test his new toy to see how it works. He may not mean any harm, but power is a very dangerous tool in the hands of an inexperienced person. Keep every semblance of power to persecute for conscience's sake out of the hands of even the best of men, if you would have religious liberty.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.11*

E. J. Waggoner

The Pacific Press Publishing House has just issued a new book that is of special interest to all Bible students. It is entitled "Sacred Chronology," and "The Peopling of the Earth." The "Sacred Chronology" is a revised reprint of "Bliss's Analysis of Sacred Chronology," first printed in 1850. It is the best treatise on the subject of the Bible chronology that there is. It has the advantage of being later than all the others, and the additional advantage that it establishes the dates of the events of the Bible, by the words of the Bible itself. It consists of three parts:-*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.12*

First, in explanation of what chronology is, with full explanation of the different cycles, epochs, periods, and eras, such as the Julian Period, the Era of the Olympiads, the Roman Era, the Christian Era, etc*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.13*

Second, the chronology of the Bible, given in the words of the Bible itself, from creation till the writing of the book of Revelation, A.D. 98. With this also there are given the following tables: (1) A table of dates from Adam to Aaron; (2) a table of the times of the judges; (3) a comparative table of the kings of Israel and Judah from the division of the kingdom at the death of Solomon to the accession of Jehu; (4) a like table from the accession of Jehu to the fall of Samaria. By these tables in addition to the text, the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah are made so plain that anyone can easily understand their relation. To many it is one of the most perplexing parts of the Scriptures to get a clear understanding of the times and the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah, as given in the books of Kings. This little treatise with its tables relieves the subject of all difficulty.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.14*

Third, is an essay on the chronology of the patriarchal age, vindicating the faithfulness of the Hebrew text as against the claims of the Samaritan and Septuagint versions.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.15*

"The Peopling of the Earth" is a little treatise of fifty-two pages, containing a series of historical notes on the tenth chapter of Genesis. Beginning with the text (*Genesis 9:19*), "These are the three sons of Noah; and of them was the whole earth overspread," the sons of Noah and their sons and grandsons, as given in the tenth chapter of Genesis, are sketched in their history as they overspread the whole earth. The matter is given in an easy, running narrative of the nature of which some idea may be gathered from the statement of a gentleman who said that he had read it, and was really interested in it, when he was seasick. And everybody knows who has ever had any experience in that direction, that a thing of any kind must be intensely interesting to find any favor with a person who is seasick.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.16*

The book altogether-"Sacred Chronology" and "The Peopling of the Earth"-contains 300 pages and is almost invaluable to any diligent student of the Bible. The price, too, places it within the reach of all. Bound in cloth, \$1.00; sheep, \$1.50; full morocco, \$1.75. Every minister, mission worker, Sabbath-school teacher, and college student ought to have a copy. Send for one and study it.*SITI December 8, 1887, page 752.17*

December 15, 1887

"The Spirit of Antichrist. No 4" The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

If we examine the heathen world, we shall find that the deception by which Eve fell was the same by which they plunged into abominable idolatries. Pride, the exaltation of self to the place of Deity, resulted in degradation; for "pride goeth before destruction," and "when pride cometh, then cometh shame." Paul also is authority for the statement that when one is "lifted up with pride," he is in danger of falling "into the condemnation of the devil." 1 Timothy 3:6. *SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.1*

Although there was heathenism centuries before the time of Plato, we may take the heathenism of his day as a type of all, since it was he who first systematized the so-called philosophy of the heathen. Everybody knows that one of the cardinal points of Plato's philosophy was the theory of the immortality of the soul; but perhaps comparatively few realize that this doctrine of his sprung directly from the idea that the soul of man is itself supreme, a part of God. We quote the following concerning his teaching:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.2*

"There is no doctrine on which Plato more frequently or more strenuously insists than this,-that soul is not only superior to body, but prior to it in point of time, and that not only as it exists in the being of God, but in every order of existence. The soul of the world existed first, and then it was closed within material body. The souls which animate the sun, moon, and stars existed before the bodies which they inhabited. The pre-existence of human souls is one of the arguments on which he relies to prove its immortality."-*Prof. W. S. Tyler, of Amherst College, in Schaff-Hezog Cyclopaedia. SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.3*

By the following quotation from Priestly's "Heathen Philosophy," it will be seen that this doctrine of the pre-existence of human souls, upon which Plato built his doctrine of their immortality, is in reality a claim that the soul is self-existent, or, in other words, that each soul is a god:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.4*

"Every soul,' he says (Phoedrus) 'is immortal. That which is always in motion is from eternity, but that which is moved by another must have an end.' Accordingly he maintained the *pre-existence* as well as the *immortality* of the soul; and in the East these two doctrines always went together, and are always ascribed to Pythagorus; the soul and the body being supposed to have only a temporary connection, to answer a particular purpose. 'The soul existed,' he says (*Dr. Lea*, lib. 10), 'before bodies were produced, and is the chief agent in the changes and the management of the body.' Agreeably to this doctrine, Plato maintained that all the knowledge we seem to acquire here is only the recollection of what we know in a former state." *SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.5*

The heathen philosophy, therefore, was simply a deification of the human. The mind of man was made the "lord of itself and all the world beside," a part of God, and consequently answerable only to itself. Now what was the result of this self-exaltation? The apostle Paul gives the answer. Speaking of the heathen, he says that they were without excuse,-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.6*

"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves; who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever." *Romans 1:21-25. SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.7*

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." Pride, which caused the fall of Satan, was at the bottom of their degradation. To be sure they had knowledge, and made great progress in the arts, but they attributed whatever knowledge they had to their own innate superiority. They looked within for everything, and began to worship themselves, because in their conceit they couldn't imagine anything else in the universe so worthy of worship as themselves. Thus that which they did know contributed to their folly, because they cut themselves loose from the only source of wisdom. The light that was in them became darkness, and the darkness was very great. Now read a further consequence of their claim that they possessed the attributes of Deity:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.8*

"And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despisers, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding,

covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful; who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." *Romans 1:28-32*.SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.9

Quotations from history might be given to any extent, to show that the first chapter of Romans does accurately describe the moral condition of the ancient heathen world; but they are not necessary to our present purpose. We merely wish to show that the working the spirit of antichrist is the same in all ages of the world; that since the elevation of man to an equality with Deity by claiming for him inherent immortality, was the cause of the moral degradation of the ancient heathen, the same thing in this age will result in the same way. Compare the quotation in the preceding paragraph with *Galatians 5:19-21*, and it will be seen that the two lists of sins are almost identical, and that when men became so swelled up with pride that they fancied themselves gods, and thus cut themselves loose from God, the abominable practices into which they fell were simply the outcroppings of their own human nature which they were worshiping instead of God.SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.10

But there are only too great opposing forces,-Christ and antichrist,-and when men cast off their allegiance to God, they necessarily enlist under the banner of Satan. And so while the heathen were exalting self, they were in reality worshiping the devil. It could not be otherwise. In harmony with this conclusion, are the words of Paul: "But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils." *1 Corinthians 10:20*. The psalmist, also, describing the apostasy of the Israelites, says that they "were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works. And they served their idols, which were a snare unto them. Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils." *Psalms 106:35-37*. From *Leviticus 17:7* and *Deuteronomy 32:15-7*, also, we learn that when the Jews forsook the Lord, and practiced heathen worship, they sacrificed to devils.SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.11

Heathenism everywhere, and in all ages of the world, is simply some form of devil worship. The ancient heathen, like modern Spiritualists, consulted with "familiar" spirits, as we learn from *Deuteronomy 18:9-12*:-SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.12

"When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord; and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee."SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.13

The most noted of these places where the ancients consulted with familiar spirits were the oracles of Apollo, at Dodona, Delphi, and Trophonius, in Greece. The priests and priestesses who conveyed the message of these oracles to the people, would in these days be called mediums, clairvoyants, etc. It is well known that the philosopher Socrates had a familiar spirit, a *demon*, without whose advice he would do nothing.SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.14

From the *Gospel in All Lands* (September, 1887) we take the following extract concerning the religion of the inhabitants of Java:-SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.15

"The native Javanese... are Mohammedans as much as anything. In former times they were Buddhists and Brahmins. They worship their ancestors, and seem to have gathered something from every system of religion with which they have come in contact. The number of the spirits worshiped is almost without limit. In nearly every place there is a patron spirit to whose influence the good or bad fortune of the village is ascribed."SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.16

Concerning the religion of the inhabitants of Ceylon, the same authority says:-SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.17

"Buddha has a multitude of followers among the Cingalese. But mild and moral as his doctrines are, they have failed 'to arrest man in his career of passion and pursuit,' and many of his so-called followers have stolid indifference to religion of any form. 'Yet, strange to say, under the coldness there are superstitious fires whose flames overtop the icy summits of Buddhist philosophy, and excite a deeper awe in the mind of the Cingalese. Hence it demon-worship, their earliest form of religion, is still extant. Devil-priests, on every domestic occurrence, and in their calamities, are called in, and their barbarous ceremonies performed. Devil-dancers are implicitly relied upon in times of sickness, and before the patient they personate the demon which is afflicting him, and spend the night in performing fiendish rights, and in the morning exorcise the demon and go away with the rich offering, praying that the life of the sufferer may be spared. Buddhist priests connive at this worship, and even practice it, because they cannot suppress it."SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.18

Like the Javanese, Chinese, also, as is well known, worship their ancestors, and their gods, like those of the heathen of Greece and Rome, are simply deified dead men and women, whose fame is thus perpetuated. Anybody who has been in a Chinese "Joss House," has seen, among the images of supposed ancient heroes and sages, a "good devil" and perhaps a "bad devil," whose favor must be gained, or whose wrath propitiated; and one can scarcely pass through a street in a Chinese village without seeing burning papers which are designed to drive the evil spirits away. And so if all the nations of heathendom were passed in review, it would be seen that the Scripture writers were correct in their statements that the heathen sacrifice to devils. W.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.19*

"A Holy Day, Not a Holiday" The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Church News* (Oakland) says:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.20*

"The Seventh-day Adventists believe that Saturday ought to be kept as a holiday of rest now by all Christendom, but they are not willing to affirm it openly and publicly."*SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.21*

Possibly the *News* thinks that it has warrant for such a statement; if so, we are happy to tell it, and others who may be equally misinformed, the exact truth about the matter.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.22*

In the first place let it be understood that Seventh-day Adventists hold to no belief which they are not willing to affirm openly and publicly. Such a charge is a little out of the usual order, for they are usually complained of as being too ready to urge their belief upon the attention of others. They hold to nothing which they are not willing to have brought to the light of day, and upon which they do not invite the freest criticism, believing that truth will survive every attack upon it, and will shine brighter for those attacks; and they do not wish to hold any doctrine which is not truth.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.23*

Secondly, it is a gross error to say that "Seventh-day Adventists believe that Saturday ought to be kept as a holiday of rest now by all Christendom." Nothing in the world is further from their desire. They do believe that the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday, ought to be kept as the Sabbath of the Lord, not simply by all Christendom, but by all the world; the obligation rests upon the infidel and the heathen, as well as on the professing Christian, because when God said: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," he addressed the whole world, and not any special class. "The Sabbath was made for man," and therefore the obligation to keep it rests upon all mankind.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 758.24*

But Seventh-day Adventists do not believe that Saturday ought to be kept as a holiday by anybody. It is a *holy day*, made such by the Creator himself, and so it ought to be kept. To observe the seventh day as a holiday,-a day of amusement, joy, and gaiety,-would be to violate the commandment of God, and we not only *believe*, but we *know* that that commandment ought to be strictly observed by every person in the world. This we and all Seventh-day Adventists are willing and anxious to declare openly and publicly, at all times and in all places. Let it be forever remembered, however, that when we say that all men ought to keep the seventh day, we do not mean to intimate that they should be forced to do so, nor that anybody should attempt to force them to keep it. This follows as a natural consequence of the fact that the Sabbath is a holy day and not a holiday. Civil laws cannot make a holy day, neither can they enforce the observance of a holy day. If the State were to attempt to enforce the observance of a holy day, it would at the best succeed in making men hypocrites, but it could not secure the proper observance of the day. And since anything less than the proper observance of the Sabbath is sin, it is evident that for the State to attempt to enforce the observance of the Sabbath would be to strengthen men in sin, by making them believe that the outward observance of the Sabbath, which is all that the State could exact, is all that God requires. It would, in fact, be compelling men to sin. Therefore, even if Seventh-day Adventists were in the majority, which we are sure they never will be, we should be utterly opposed to any movement looking toward the enforced observance of the seventh day.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.1*

While we are free to declare our belief in regard to Sabbath, we are just as free to declare our sentiments in regard to Sunday. Sunday was from the beginning of its career only a holiday, the "wild solar holiday of all pagan times." The Catholic Church adopted it, along with many other heathen customs, from the pagans, by which she so conciliated them that they gave her their allegiance; and the Protestant churches have received it as a legacy from the Catholic Church.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.2*

Since the most that can be said for Sunday is that it is only a holiday of the church, without any divine sanction whatever, there is no obligation resting upon anybody to keep it. It has no more sacredness than Monday or Tuesday, or any other working day of the week. This we are willing to affirm openly and publicly, and we have no fear that our statement will be disproved. But although Sunday is not a sacred day, it is a

religious institution, an institution of the church. Therefore when the State makes laws enforcing its observance even as a holiday, it goes beyond its right. To compel men to observe Sunday is to compel them to commit sin; for men will not rest upon two days of the week, and if they are compelled to rest on Sunday, they are thereby forced to labor upon the Sabbath, thus disobeying the command of God. Moreover, even though men would observe both days, if their conscience would not allow them to disobey God, Sunday laws would still be iniquitous, because they tend to elevate Sunday above the other working days of the week.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.3*

Therefore we are willing to affirm openly and publicly that we are utterly and uncompromisingly opposed to Sunday laws of every kind and degree. We are opposed to them not because it would interfere with *our* rights as citizens, but because they are against the rights of every citizen. The Gospel gives to every man the fullest liberty of choice as to whether or not he will obey God. "Whosoever will, let him come," is the gospel call, and this invitation carries with it the negative, that whosoever is not inclined may stay away from the waters of life. Now when the State makes laws concerning any establishment of religion, it cuts directly across this freedom of choice. It compels some to do that which their conscience tells them they ought not to do; it forbids others to change their practice when their conscience shall become enlightened; and compel others to conform to a religious practice, when they have no conscience at all in the matter. If anybody wishes a more explicit declaration of our position upon this matter, we are prepared to give it, and to answer any questions that may be asked. *W.SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.4*

"Is It Temperance or Sunday?" The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Independent*, in its notice of the recent meeting of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at Nashville, Tenn., makes the following comment on the resolution which was passed in favor of Sunday liquor laws:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.5*

"It is our opinion that the great fight against liquor will be made more successfully on a much broader platform than that of a Sunday law. It is possible to make so much of the Sunday feature of the law as to ensure the cause, and of this there is some danger."*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.6*

The *Independent* is correct; if the fight against the liquor traffic is ever to be successful, it will have to be made on a basis much broader than that of a Sunday law. For although a Sunday liquor law might be secured, the liquor traffic would still be entrenched as strongly as ever, yes, even more strongly than ever. Perhaps this may not be apparent to all, for many imagine that to oppose the so-called Sunday liquor laws is to array one's self on the side of the saloons, and against temperance. This can easily be shown to be an error.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.7*

In the first place, the passage of a Sunday prohibitory liquor law gives the liquor traffic a legal status on other days. It is true that it is not expressly declared that liquor selling is right on other days than Sunday; but the natural inference from law declaring it to be wrong to sell liquor on Sundays is that it is all right to sell it on other days. The mother says to her boy, "Johnnie, you must not play with your ball to-day; it is Sunday." The only idea Johnnie would get would be that is wrong to play ball on Sunday; he certainly would never get the idea that it is not right to play ball at other times; and the mother would not expect him to. If the boy were doing anything that is wrong in itself, smoking, for instance, she would use different language. She would say, "You must not do that, my son;" and this she would say on Monday or Wednesday just the same as on Sunday. If she should say, "You must not smoke to-day; it is Sunday," the boy would conclude at once that all the wrong consisted in doing the act on Sunday, but that his mother would not object to his smoking on any other day. Even, so to discriminate, and say that liquor shall not be sold on Sunday, is to say it in effect that liquor-selling is all right in itself on any other day than Sunday.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.8*

This idea is strengthened by the fact that those who oppose the "Sunday saloons" also oppose the Sunday newspaper, the Sunday railroad train, Sunday mails, etc., things which are perfectly legitimate in themselves. By classing the "Sunday saloon" with these other things, the professed temperance people lift it to the same level.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.9*

But it is argued by many that the Sunday prohibitory liquor law is a move in the right direction, and that it is best to take what they can get, hoping for more by and by. They say they expect to get prohibition some time, but they cannot get it all at once, and so they will take prohibition on one day. It is strange that the fallacy of this plea cannot be seen by everybody at a single glance. It is right here that we find the plainest kind of evidence that the Sunday liquor law is not a move in behalf of temperance, but is only a movement for the protection of Sunday. Suppose for a moment that the movement in this affair were all true temperance men,-men who believe that the liquor traffic ought to be prohibited because it is an evil, and only an evil, to society,-does anyone suppose that they would be content with closing the saloons on Sunday only? No; when once

they had massed their strength sufficiently to close the saloons on one day in the week they would close them every day. If they want total prohibition, there is no reason on earth why they shouldn't get what they want, if they have the power to secure prohibition one day in the week. With their hands once on the monster's throat they would not relax their grasp until it was choked to death.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.10*

It matters not that many of those who strenuously favor a Sunday liquor law are honest in their intentions, and are really actuated by temperance principles, the fact remains that there are not enough of such ones to carry the thing, for if there were they would have absolute prohibition. Those who look no further than the protection of Sunday are largely in the majority. We say again that the securing of a Sunday prohibitory law is not a move in the direction of total prohibition, but rather against it; for the fact that a lot of professed temperance men have the power in their hands to prohibit the liquor traffic, and stop short with prohibiting it one day in the week, will give that traffic a prestige that it has never before had.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.11*

We conclude, therefore, that the whole thing centers around Sunday, and is prompted, with few exceptions, by no other motive than to protect that day from desecration. If any feel inclined to dispute this proposition still further, and claim that the only desire is to protect the homes of the people—that Sunday is a general holiday, and the saloons are allowed to keep open, the laboring men and the youth, being idle, will be enticed into them more than at any other time, we would call attention to the fact that the working men are at liberty from about 5 o'clock Saturday afternoon, and that from then until midnight they have seven hours' holiday, during which time the saloons are in full blast, and still there is no attempt on foot to abolish the Saturday-night saloons. There is ample opportunity for the laborers to spend all their money in drink before Sunday morning, and too often this is done. If this is a "home-protection movement," then let it cover all the time when homes are in danger. More than this, the youth are usually at leisure the whole of Saturday, yet the "temperance" zeal reaches no further than the suppressing the Sunday saloon. The more arguments men bring to bear to support the Sunday prohibitory law, the more is its real nature disclosed. We repeat, the movement is against temperance, rather than in its favor, and wholly in the interest of the Sunday. The following from the *Christian Statesman*, of December, 1887, will bear out this assertion. It occurs in the report of a national reform meeting in Philadelphia:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.12*

"The Rev. Dr. Barr showed how a consistent national Christianity would throw open to religious influence large classes of men and women who are now utterly inaccessible. For example, there are from six to ten thousand saloon-keepers in the city, who, from the very nature of their business, cannot be reached with the gospel. A Christian Government would abolish their business, and leave them free to be reached like other men."*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.13*

This, of course, looks toward entire suppression, but the principle is the same. In a meeting in the interests of a Sunday law, held in Oakland last winter, Rev. Dr. Briggs complained that the churches were charged with the duty of instructing the people in morals, and then, on account of the absence of any Sunday law, the people were free to wander into all places of amusement, so that the churches could not get at them. And whenever any "Sunday temperance" movement is sifted to the bottom, this will be found to be the ultimate object.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.14*

The *Independent* is right; if the professed temperance people of the country want to make any real headway against liquor, they will have to build a much broader platform than Sunday laws; for when their Sunday laws shall have been passed, liquor will be here still, and more strongly entrenched than ever. W.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 759.15*

"Catholics and Hungarians" The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

An assembly of Catholic Hungarians has voted an address to the Pope. It favors granting temporal power to him. Semi-official journals protest against the address, which they say does not represent the genuine opinion of the Hungarian Catholics.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 761.1*

"The Week of Prayer" The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

We would again call the attention of our readers, especially of those who are in any way connected with the body of the Sabbath-keepers, to the week of prayer, which has already been referred to. December 17-24, inclusive, is the time appointed, and the day or evening following, being Christmas, is designated as the time for special offerings to be made to foreign missions. It is expected that during the week of prayer all the churches will hold meetings every day, or in the evening, if it is not possible for all the members to assemble in the day-time. For each day's meeting a special article has been prepared. The subjects are the

following:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 761.2*

For Sabbath, December 17, which is appointed as a fast-day, "The Importance of Devoting the Week of Prayer to the Special Work of Seeking God;" Sunday, December 18, "Steps by Which We place Ourselves in a Condition Where God Can Accept Us;" Monday, December 19, "The Blessing of God Brought to Us Through Faith;" Tuesday, December 20, "The Object of God's Blessing, and How It Can Be Obtained;" Wednesday, December 21, "Missionary Work-in the Family, in the Neighborhood, and in the Church;" Thursday, December 22, "The Work in Great Britain and Scandinavia;" a Friday, December 23, "The Central European Mission;" Sabbath, December 24, "The Obligation, Privilege, and Blessing of Giving."*SITI December 15, 1887, page 761.3*

The Christmas exercises are expected to be such as shall harmonize with the spirit of the week of prayer. It is hoped that during that week all will have had such a sense of their dependence upon God, and of his abundant goodness, that they will feel it to be a very feeble expression of gratitude due, to give liberally for the missions, which are now languishing for want of means. It has been proposed that at the Christmas gathering, before the offerings are made, brief sketches of the different foreign missions be given; and a circular letter suggesting a programme for the evening, and giving statistics of the missions, has been prepared and sent out.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 761.4*

Concerning the propriety of making gifts instead of receiving them on Christmas, nothing need be said. The plan has been tested abundantly. Some have thought that the children would be disappointed to see a Christmas tree with nothing on it for them; but our experience is that they are much better satisfied when the donations are for some worthy enterprise, and they are allowed to share in the giving, than when they are the recipients. With the latter plan there is always more or less envy, because some are more highly favored than others, while in the proposed plan there is no chance for envy; a lesson of unselfishness is taught, and the children prove the truth of the saying that it is more blessed to give than to receive.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 761.5*

Sabbath-keepers who are isolated so that they cannot meet with others should spend the week of prayer in seeking God by themselves, following the course of the meetings as nearly as they can from a reading of the subjects. Their Christmas offerings may be sent to either of the Publishing Houses, or to the nearest Tract Society Secretary, and they will all be credited to the Foreign Mission Fund. *W.SITI December 15, 1887, page 761.6*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

The New York *Observer* has sent letters to 501 Congregational Churches in New England, asking how they stand concerning the doctrine of probation after death. Of the replies received, 430 express emphatic disapproval of the theory, and the *Observer's* conclusion is that "not more than four to five per cent. of the churches of New England tolerate the hypothesis of *post-mortem* probation."*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.1*

We have received from the publishing house in Battle Creek, Mich., a pamphlet of fifty-two pages, entitled, "Prophetic History of the World," containing what we conceive to be an exposition of the seventh and eighth chapters of Daniel, in the Dutch language, and also an assortment of tracts in the same language. The tracts are the following: The Law and the Gospel-The Sabbath of the Bible-The Sanctuary of the Bible-The Sabbath made for Man-Seven Reasons for Sunday-keeping Examined-Which Day Do You Keep, and Why?-Is Man Immortal?-The Millennium-Who Changed the Sabbath?-The Sufferings of Christ-and two temperance tracts: The Curse of Our Nation, and Alcoholic Poison. We are glad that the Hollanders may now read the truth in their own language. People who are acquainted with any of that nationality should make a note of this.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.2*

The subject of the discourse by Dr. Barrows, pastor of the First Congregationalist Church, San Francisco, a few Sundays ago, was, "The Sunday Question-the Present Needs and Hopes Concerning It." In this discourse he is reported to have said:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.3*

"Catholicity is needed to obtain a true solution to this question. All we can expect is a civil moral law. If the Catholics, the Protestants, and the Jews all ask for it, where is the Legislature that would refuse? A breadth of view is necessary which will drop out of sight all our minor, individual views, and will unite us for the one common cause. This question is of supreme importance in this country at the present time, and we know of no other which equals it, except the temperance question."*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.4*

We will not at present comment on the anomaly of "a civil moral law," but will ask special note to be made of

the fact that Protestants are seriously proposing an alliance with Catholicism in order to influence legislation in favor of Sunday. Leaving aside all question as to whether or not Sunday should be observed as the Sabbath, is it not evident that somebody's rights are going to be infringed when Protestants and Catholics unite to influence legislation? When did Rome ever combine with any power, except to her own advantage? Is it not time for somebody to be aroused?*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.5*

The following news item we clip from the *Christian Union*:—*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.6*

"The Rev. Dr. J. B. Fulton is still delivering his series of lectures against Romanism, and was recently attacked by a mob in Biddeford, Maine, which stoned the hall and drove the lecturer away. Dr. Fulton, however, was returned to Biddeford, by invitation of the Protestant clergymen of that city and Saco, and has begun another series of lectures on the same subject."*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.7*

The story is told that a poor shoemaker used to attend the theological controversies, which were conducted in Latin. When asked what benefit he derived from the discussions, since he knew nothing of the language, he replied that he could always tell which party was in the wrong, because that party always got angry. If we did not have any knowledge of Romanism, we should know that it is a gross error, because it always replies with violence to any attacks upon it. Truth never uses any arguments but those of sober reason. Whenever in a religious body attempts to use physical force in defense of its dogmas, it may be set down as a fact that it is utterly impossible to uphold those dogmas from the Bible. The same principle applies in the case of the attempts of professed Protestants to secure laws enforcing Sunday observance. It is because they cannot uphold it by the Bible as a religious institution, that they wish to have it enforced as a civil institution.*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.8*

"Excessive Conscientiousness" The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

What the *Independent* terms "a curious case of conscientiousness" has just developed in Dubuque, Iowa. The facts, as given, are these:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.9*

"The ladies connected with the management of the Iowa Home of the Friendless have been in the habit of having a great ball every year, to raise money for their institution. This year, owing to a series of revival meetings in the city, the date of the ball was postponed until it was expected that the meetings would be concluded. As the meetings, however, were to continue, and the excitement of the coming ball was distracting the attention of the young people, several of the clergymen offered to canvass for money for the Home, if the ball should be given up, and expressed the opinion that a larger amount would thus be raised. No notice was taken of this offer. Then a number of ladies, some of them interested in the Home, offered to give it a thousand dollars on the same condition, this being a considerably larger sum than the ball usually netted."*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.10*

The ladies gave this generous offer "earnest and prayerful deliberation," and then respectfully declined it, and the following is a part of their reason therefore:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.11*

"As a band of Christian women, working for a charitable institution, we cannot consistently, or in justice to ourselves, admit or assume for any consideration that this innocent amusement that we have for years provided as a means to help us in support of our charitable work, can be in any way inconsistent or detrimental to a Christian life or character.... We earnestly recommend these young converts and those that may feel that this or any other amusement or recreation will be a blemish on that higher and better life to which all these things must be subservient, to lean not on any human arm for counsel or support, but as individuals to search their own consciences in the sight of their heavenly Father, and he will give them strength to follow its dictates fearlessly and cheerfully. And it was further resolved that it is not too late to abandon the proposed ball, preparations having already proceeded too far in that direction, and in justice to those who have labored hard and given much valuable time in order to make a financial success, we cannot further consider the proposition of the committee."*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.12*

The *Independent*, with fine sarcasm, says that "the sensitiveness of these ladies for the rights of those of their number who have labored to make the ball a success, is something touching." But it seems as though a little conscientious fear of endangering the salvation of souls, would have given better evidence of the true spirit of Christianity. In this affair we have an instance of how people may delude themselves into thinking that they are conscientiously serving God, when their every act proclaims them "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God."*SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.13*

"Alden's Manifesto 'Cyclopedia of Knowledge and Language' The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

To those who wish a cheap cyclopedia, and yet one which is sufficiently comprehensive for all practical purposes, we can heartily recommend this work, the first volume of which is before us. It is more than a mere cyclopedia, as the following extract from the Publisher's Notice will show: "The 'Manifold Cyclopedia' undertakes to present a survey of the entire circle of knowledge, whether of words or of things, thus combining the characteristics of a cyclopedia and a dictionary, including in its vocabulary every word which has any claim to a place in the English language. It does not especially attempt originality of treatment, but aims rather to give the generally accepted views of the most eminent scholars of the world, upon all the topics discussed." An excellent feature of the work is that the pronunciation of every name is indicated. The first volume contains 630 pages, and covers the ground from A to America. From this some idea can be gained as to the comprehensiveness of the work. The book is four inches by seven in size, single column, well illustrated. The price, 50 cents in cloth, and 65 cents in half morocco binding, with 10 cents additional for postage, places it within the reach of everybody. The volumes will be issued at intervals of about one month, and a specimen copy may be ordered and returned if not wanted. John B. Alden, publisher, 303 Pearl Street, New York. *SITI December 15, 1887, page 768.14*

"Lesson Pamphlet" The Signs of the Times, 13, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

At the late session of the International Sabbath-school Association, the following recommendation by the Lesson Committee was adopted:-*SITI December 15, 1887, page 784.1*

"That the lessons for 1888 be written immediately and, after approval by the executive Committee, that they be published in two pamphlets, of twenty-six lessons each, for the use of Sabbath-school officers and teachers." *SITI December 15, 1887, page 784.2*

The lessons for the first six months of 1888 are now ready, and orders for the first of the above-mentioned pamphlets may now be sent in. this pamphlet will also contain the lesson that has been prepared for the use of the Senior Division at the camp-meetings. Price, post-paid, 10 cents. Send orders to Pacific Press, Oakland, Cal. *SITI December 15, 1887, page 784.3*

It should be borne in mind that this pamphlet is only "for the use of Sabbath-school officers and teachers." It is not designed for general circulation. Sabbath-school scholars will receive their lesson week by week as heretofore, and that is sufficient for their needs. But the Committee recognized the fact that it is often an advantage to teachers to know what is coming, by means of this pamphlet, moreover, ministers who are traveling from place to place visiting churches, and attending camp-meetings, may always be able to join with the school in the lesson for the day, although they may not have received any *Instructor*. Whenever a minister visits a school, the officers and teachers expect help from him, and valuable suggestions in regard to the lessons, and they have a right to expect this. But very often they are disappointed, because he "didn't have any paper, and therefore couldn't learn the lesson." They will no longer have this excuse, and the schools may hereafter feel free to call upon a minister to teach a class whenever he visits them. *SITI December 15, 1887, page 784.4*

December 22, 1887

"Explaining Miracles" *The Signs of the Times*, 13, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

Many very good persons have in the past been zealous to explain the miracles of the Bible. Of late years the number of these zealous souls have been increasing. Their motive is a laudable one, for they think that if they can take out of the way of infidels some of the difficulties of the Bible, and thus remove their objections to that book, many will accept its teachings. But however honest the motive may be, it is certain that they are engaged in a thankless task. If they knew the cause of infidelity, they would not think to cure it by such methods; and if they would stop to consider, they would see that if it were possible to explain the miracles of the Bible, there would be no inducement for an infidel or anybody else to accept its teachings. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.1*

Miracles lie at the very foundation of the gospel, and are the principal part of its superstructure. The very existence of God is a miracle; the creation of the world was a miracle; the fact that it is upheld by the same word that brought it into existence, is a miracle; our own existence is a miracle; and the plan of redemption is a stupendous miracle. A belief in miracles underlies all knowledge, and all true science. The first element of knowledge is to perceive that things exist. Before any advancement whatever can be made in science, the fact that things exist must be accepted. And this requires no reasoning, for we cannot help believing it. But the apostle says: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." *Hebrews 11:3*. We look at the heavens and the earth, and ask, How were they framed? And the answer is, God formed them out of nothing; he created the matter which composes them: "He spake and it was; he commanded and it stood fast." By his own word he caused matter to exist where the instant before there was nothing. Who can understand this? Nobody. It is a miracle; but the acceptance of it by faith underlies all true science. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.2*

But the devotee of "science falsely so called," attempts to account for the existence of the worlds in some other way. He says that all these things which we see were evolved from a single particle of matter. But when he has gone back to that atom, which, as he claims, has by repeated self-multiplication, produced the worlds, he is still confronted by the question, How did this atom come into existence? And he can never get back of that "How?" So after all his contempt for miracles, he bases his theories on a greater miracle than does the believer in the word of God. For he assumes that inanimate matter created itself out of nothing; while the Bible brings to view an intelligent Creator. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.3*

Suppose that our zealous friends should, by some miracle, succeed in explaining the miracles of the Bible; would the infidel then accept that book? Certainly not; for all reason for accepting it would be taken away. The Bible would then have been brought down to the level of man; it would be nothing more than any man could produce. We might go further, and say that if it were possible to explain the miracles of the Bible, there would be no God in whom to believe. The very existence of God implies the existence of miracles. God could not be God, and not work miracles. An infinite God *must* do things which are above the comprehension of a finite mind. They are not miracles to God; there can be no miracles to him, -for he simply does his own will. But the simplest acts of God must necessarily be above the comprehension of man. If it were not so, man would be equal to God. That the simplest acts of God are beyond human comprehension is demonstrated every day, in the growth of plants, the sunshine, the rain, and a thousand other things which we think we understand, because they are so common, but which no man can explain. We know that under certain conditions, certain results will follow; but why? God alone can answer. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.4*

And so it is a mistaken zeal which prompts one to try to explain the miracles of the Bible. No man can do it, but the very attempt to do so tends to lower God and the Bible in the estimation of unbelievers. It tends to make them think that God does not work in so very mysterious a way after all. Moreover, when believers attempt to explain miracles, the world accepts that attempt as an evidence that everything that God has done may be understood; and consequently when they read of something that absolutely defies comprehension, they reject it as false. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.5*

The reason why men are infidels is not because of the difficulties in the Bible, but because of the difficulties in their own hearts. When men lost the knowledge of God, it was not because they had nothing to reveal God to them, but "because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man." *Romans 1:21-23*. The fault was all in themselves. It is an evil heart of unbelief that causes men to depart from God, and it is the same thing that keeps them from coming to him. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.6*

Says the apostle: "But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is." *Hebrews 11:6*. This proposition is self-evident. No one can come to God unless he first believes in the existence of God. And no one believes in the existence of God if he has conjured up in his mind some image to take the place of God, which is totally unlike God. And he who believes that God is, must believe in his power to work miracles. More than this, he must believe in the absolute necessity for the performance of miracles, because from the very nature of the case the infinite God must do things that are too wonderful for man to comprehend. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.7*

The fact that God is a wonder-working God is the great source of consolation to the Christian. To be sure the Christian rests in the promises of God, but what would those promises avail if infinite power were not behind them. When Christ commissioned his disciples to preach the gospel, he fortified them with the assurance, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." And thousands have read the promises of God, and have confidently rested in them, because of the words: "There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, who rideth upon the heaven in thy help, and in his excellency on the sky. The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms." *Deuteronomy 33:26, 27. SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.8*

The miracles of the Bible are not to be explained, but believed. Our belief in them is the measure of our belief in God. We believe that God exists, that he is the Creator of all things, and accepting this fact, we do not find it at all difficult to believe that he caused the shadow on the dial of Ahaz to turn backward; that he caused the sun to stand still in the heavens, so that one day was as long as two; that he divided the Red Sea, and the River Jordan; that he caused iron to swim, and made the dumb ass speak with human voice; that he preserved Jonah alive three days in the whale's belly; or that he raised the dead. Why should he not do such things? "Our God is in the heavens; he hath done whatsoever he would." He made all things; why should we suppose that he has less power to control than he had in creating? No; it is the most natural thing in the world for our God to do wonderful things, because he is a wonderful God. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.9*

So we do not seek to explain any miracles; we cannot afford to waste time in so fruitless a task. And we know of no better way to convince infidels of the truth of the Bible than to put before them its plain declarations. The promises of God are not to those who understand them, but to those who believe them. Men may say that they can't believe; it is not so; they can believe; they *must* believe or else be lost; for "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." *W. SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.10*

"The Deep Things of God" The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

When a man has gazed into the starry heavens through a telescope, he has an idea of depth that he never had before. Let him, for instance, point his telescope toward some portion of the Milky Way, where to the naked eye only a faint haze is visible, and he will see not only countless multitudes of stars, but will be impressed with the fact that there is an infinite depth beyond, which the strongest telescope cannot fathom. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.11*

Suppose now that as the enthusiastic astronomer is dilating upon the wonders of the starry worlds, someone should say to him, "Oh! you see more in the heavens than is really there; those little shining specks are not so important as you think they are, but you have been gazing at them so intently for so long a time that everything is magnified to your vision." Almost any intelligent person would tell such an one that it is impossible to overestimate the extent and wonders of the heavens; that the telescope magnifies nothing, but simply helps us to get an approximate idea of the actual size of the heavenly bodies; and that it is just as impossible for any man to comprehend the vastness of the universe as it is for him to comprehend God. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.12*

This train of thought was suggested by one who, after a conversation upon the law of God, said: "You have been studying the subject so long that, to you, everything is magnified. It is always the case that when one thinks on a certain subject a great deal, little things assume an importance which they do not actually possess." Is this true? Can a person look into the perfect law of liberty so intently that some portions of it will assume undue proportions? Many who would agree with us in our statement concerning the heavens, will agree with our friend in his statement concerning the law; but it can be shown that the human mind can no more fathom the depths of the divine law, than it can compass the bounds of the universe. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.13*

If the law were of human origin it could be fathomed, for what one finite mind has evolved, another finite mind can comprehend. But who can know the Almighty to perfection? And the law of God is the righteous will of God. It is a transcript of his own character. This fact alone should convince anyone that there is no danger of overestimating any portion of it. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.14*

Things of human origin may often be comprehended at a glance, and then if one spends time poring over them, minor points assume undue importance. But the Scriptures, which are a commentary on the law, must be searched in order to be understood. One may imagine that his casual glance has enabled him to grasp all that is contained in a passage, and it may seem to him that there is little in it; but Paul says: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." *1 Corinthians 2:14*. And he says: "But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." *Verse 10. SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.15*

These deep things of God are revealed only to those who have Christ, for in him "are *hid* all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." *Colossians 2:3*. The psalmist David did not think there was any danger of thinking upon the law so much as to unduly exalt any portion of it, for he said: "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful. But his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." *Psalms 1:1, 2*. And of himself he said "O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day." *SITI December 22, 1887, page 774.16*

"God is love;" all men who profess to know God, make much of this fact. His love is infinite, because he *is* love, and he is infinite. But no man can understand any more of the love of God than he does of the law of God, for the love of God runs parallel with his law. The love of God is just as extensive as his law, and no more so. Just consider: His law is a law of love, and we read that it was in love that he gave it to men. *Deuteronomy 33:2, 3*. He desires that all men should have life; but they cannot have life unless they are like him; for only those who are like God can dwell in his presence, and soon the glory of the Lord is to cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. Then those who are not like God will be destroyed. But no man can see God, so as to know what it is to be like him, and so God has given us his law, the transcript of his character, that we, by conforming to it, may be like him, and so have life. Thus the law was ordained to life. The angels who have never sinned, but who "do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word," have life for that reason. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.1*

But as for men, "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;" and "God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." Why did Christ die? He himself answers: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." *John 3:16*. "Sin is the transgression of the law," and "the wages of sin is death." Hence we know that all men were doomed to death, because they had trampled upon the law of life, and God in his great love for them gave his only begotten Son, in order that they might, through faith in him, escape that awful fate. We say that this was infinite love; that in that one gift God gave all that Heaven had to bestow; and that the infinite power of God himself could do no more for guilty man than he has done. But would God take steps that were unnecessary? To give up his own Son was a sacrifice that a finite mind can never understand; would he have made that sacrifice if man could have been redeemed by any easier way? No, indeed; the love of God was no greater than was necessary to satisfy the righteous demands of his broken law. But that love was infinite; therefore the law itself is infinite. The love of God in Christ helps us to understand the law; the law of God, carefully studied, helps us to understand the love of God. Both work together. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.2*

The danger with men is that they will take too narrow and too shallow views of the law, and not that they will get too exalted ideas of its breadth and depth. Christ came to earth to "magnify the law, and make it honorable." He did not make it larger than it was before, but exhibited it in his life, so that its hidden beauties might stand out prominent. He was the living embodiment of the law. He who studies the character of Christ, with a longing desire and an earnest purpose to emulate it, is studying the deep things of God, the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, that are hidden in him. As we grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, we learn that the greatest things in the law are those things which to the natural mind appear trivial, or which do not appear at all; and with the psalmist we cry to the Lord, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." *W. SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.3*

"The Sure Word" The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we commented on the transfiguration scene, showing that it was a miniature representation of the coming of the Lord in glory, to raise the righteous dead, and to translate the living. That this was the intent of that wonderful scene is shown by the words of Christ, which immediately preceded the record of that event: "Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." *Mark 9:1*. And also by the words of Peter, who says with reference to that event: "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is

my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." *2 Peter 1:16-18.SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.4*

Even after that memorable day, the coming of the Lord must have been a more vivid reality to Peter, James, and John, than it had been before. Jesus said to them, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory," and now these three disciples could realize what that glory would be. They had been eye-witnesses of his majesty, and had beheld the glory of his coming.*SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.5*

Perhaps some may be inclined to say, "If I could have such evidence as that, I would have no doubt about the matter. If I could only see for myself, I should know that these things are so." Well now read what Peter says immediately after his reference to the transfiguration:-*SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.6*

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts; knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." *2 Peter 1:19-21.SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.7*

Here is something that is more sure than anything that man has seen: it is something that comes direct from "the Spirit of truth." Men's eyes may deceive them; but the word of prophecy does not depend upon any human faculty; it "came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Men were simply the unresisting mouth-pieces of the Spirit of God; it spoke the words, and they had no voice in the matter.*SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.8*

An instance of how the prophecy came not by the will of man, is afforded by the case of Balaam. It is true that Balaam was not a "holy man of God;" but the fact that he intended to pronounce a curse makes it more apparent that the prophecy came not by the will of man. Balaam was tempted by the promise of a great reward to go and curse Israel, but God, in his great love for his people, "turned the curse into a blessing." When Balak reproached Balaam for not cursing Israel, the latter replied, "If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the commandment of the Lord, to do either good or bad of mine own mind; but what the Lord saith, that will I speak." *Numbers 24:13.SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.9*

While Balaam was thus passive in the hands of the Lord, he uttered this prophecy: "I shall see him, but not now; I shall behold him, but not nigh; there shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth. And Edom shall be a possession, Seir also shall be a possession for his enemies; and Israel shall do valiantly. Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city." *Numbers 24:17-19.SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.10*

Here we have one instance of the "sure word of prophecy" concerning the coming of the Lord. Considering the circumstances under which it was uttered, it is a notable instance. It shows most fully that prophecy is something that has in it nothing of the human, but is wholly divine. No human frailty enters into it, but it comes direct from the Holy Spirit. Thus it is "more sure" than human eyesight. For this reason it is that it was said: "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." *SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.11*

Still more ancient than the prophecy given through Balaam is the one uttered by Enoch. Jude speaks of the destruction of the wicked, and says (*verses 14, 15*): "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." *SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.12*

The well-known prophecy uttered by Job is perhaps more ancient than that spoken by Balaam. After expressing a wish that his words might be graven in the enduring rock, he said: "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." *Job 19:25-27.SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.13*

This prophecy brings to view the Christian's hope, namely, the resurrection of the dead at the coming of the Lord, showing that from the earliest times this was the hope of God's people. It was "the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers." *Acts 26:6*. But more explicit than any yet quoted, as showing "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," is the following by "the sweet psalmist of Israel," who could say, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue." *2 Samuel 23:2*. The word of the Lord, which was in

his tongue, said:-*SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.14*

"The mighty God, even the Lord, hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof. Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined. Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." *Psalms 50:1-5.SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.15*

Again the Lord spoke by him to the same intent: "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad; let the sea roar, and the fulness thereof. Let the field be joyful, and all that is therein; then shall all the trees of the wood rejoice Before the Lord; for he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth; he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth." *Psalms 96:11-13.SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.16*

With this we must close for this week. Next week we shall quote further from the "sure word of prophecy" concerning the coming of the Lord, and shall then give further evidence that the word of prophecy is sure. *W.SITI December 22, 1887, page 775.17*

"A Desert Place" The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

Many persons, anxious to find some excuse for sprinkling instead of baptism, have argued that it was impossible that Philip could have found enough water to immerse the eunuch, because the record says that the way which they went "is desert." Such persons must have a difficulty with the narrative which forms the basis of the present lesson; for the record says that Jesus departed "into a desert place apart," and that "when it was evening, his disciples came to him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past; send a multitude away, that they may go into the villages and by themselves victuals;" and yet it says that "he commanded the multitude to sit down *on the grass*," before he fed them.*SITI December 22, 1887, page 770.1*

The answer to the objection concerning the eunuch's baptism is, as we see in the latter instance, that "a desert place" does not necessarily mean a place where there is no water and no vegetation. It applies to any uninhabited, solitary place. It may be a sandy, barren waste, or it may be a place where there is vegetation. Even in the great Sahara Desert, which is to most minds a synonym for everything barren, there are cases where there are springs of water, and where vegetation flourishes.*SITI December 22, 1887, page 770.2*

Even supposing that "the way that goeth down from Jerusalem to Gaza," which Philip and the eunuch traveled, was a sandy desert like the Sahara, we must allow that the two travelers came across a fertile place where there was water enough for immersion, for that the "baptism" means immerse, and that only, is admitted by the best scholars, even though they practice sprinkling instead. When God commands that a certain thing shall be done, and especially when his word says that it was done, it is hardly worth while for men to argue that it cannot be done. *W.SITI December 22, 1887, page 770.3*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

The report of the Annual Convention of the National W. C. T. U. say of the one who made the opening prayer:-*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.1*

"She opened with a prayer that carried all hearts up to God, 'Our Mother God as well as our Father.'" *SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.2*

This is dose enough for our readers at one time, so we forbear giving any more till another time.*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.3*

A friend and renewing his subscription refers to *Revelation 16:13, 14*, and also *Revelation 17:13, 14*, and asks if it may not be that modern Spiritualism is warring with the word of God. Of course it may be. Modern Spiritualism does nothing else. If it was devised by the great enemy of truth, and its sole object is to lead men away from the truth of the Bible. Our friends need not be in doubt on that point.*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.4*

Let it not be forgotten, to the credit of the ladies of the National Woman's Christian temperance Union, recently assembled in annual convention in Nashville, Tenn., that they passed a resolution deprecating the slaughter of birds in order to decorate ladies' bonnets. Of course this pledges each member of the Union to abstain from the use of such decorations, and we may hope ere long to see the savage custom a thing of the

past among civilized people.*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.5*

There is no question that is growing faster in the United States to-day than is the Sunday question. It is coming nearer and nearer to the point where it will be an essential factor in the political field. And the *Christian Nation* announces the intention of it all, thus:-*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.6*

"Let those who will remember the Sabbath to keep it holy from motives of love and obedience; the remnant must be made to do so through fear of law. We have no option."*-Christian Nation, September 28, 1887.SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.7*

The *Christian Cynosure* reports the following church item:-*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.8*

Rev. H. C. Heyser, pastor of a German Evangelical Church, has resigned. He says: "The cause of the disagreement is due to the fact that we have socialists and anarchists among the church members. They want a religion without a Christ and a world without a God. That is a kind of theology of which I have no understanding, and not being able to preach it resigned. The most influential members in the congregation, it appears, are either saloon keepers or proprietors of shooting galleries, and the church is unable to discipline them."*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.9*

It would seem that a church that had not the power to discipline such members as that, had better cease to be called a church, because it is in fact just anything at all *but* a church.*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.10*

The National Reformers indignantly deny the charge that they are laboring for a union of Church and State, but insist that what they want is a union of Religion and State. The Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D., General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, and author of the well-known book, "Our Country," has expressed himself to the same effect. He, with the National Reformers, wants not Church and State, but Religion and State. Says Dr. Strong, "I distinguish, as some apparently do not, between *Church* and *Religion*."*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.11*

Now we think we know enough about mathematics to work out so simple a problem as is here presented. The three terms are these, the State, the Church, and Religion. They say that they designed to keep Church and State forever separate and distinct, but that Religion must be closely united. The result of our calculation is that if they succeed in their design they will necessarily have to divorce the Church and Religion. If this solution is not correct, we should be glad if someone would point out the defect in our calculation. We verily believe that when the National Reformers, and their many friends who do not go by that name, shall have accomplished their purpose, no one of acute perception will have any difficulty in distinguishing between Church and Religion. There may be a *form* of Religion but the power will have fled forever.*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.12*

The following from a correspondent of the *Congregationalist*, is an example of the natural working of the theory of a probation after death:-*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.13*

"One of our clergymen, not long ago, wrote a paper in defense of the Andover theology. The paper was printed and a copy sent to me. Not far from this time I met the son of this clergyman, and as we were conversing on religious matters, he lightly said: 'Well, if there's going to be another chance in the next world, I guess I won't trouble myself about religion now.'"*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.14*

Let it be remembered that this "Andover theology" is but another phase of the well-known doctrine of the Age-to-come, and that all Age-to-come teaching tends to directly lull men into security.*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.15*

"Good Words for Rome" The Signs of the Times, 13, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

Quite a sensation was made in one of the meetings of the Christian Conference just held in Washington, D.C., by a reference to the Catholic Church. Mr. Simon E. Baldwin, of New Haven, Conn., asked what church had best observed and guarded the teachings of the Bible regarding the family and divorce, and replied that no church represented in that conference, but only "the older Christian church with its head at Rome." He said that he was sorry that in this conference he had listened to unkind words respecting the sole Christian church. At this same member cried out, "I object to that; I don't believe it is a Christian church at all." After the buzz of excitement that followed this had subsided, Mr. Baldwin rejoined:-*SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.16*

"That is exactly the sentiment that I have heard uttered from this platform, and against which I protest. In my work with Mr. Dike in the divorce-reform league, I have found no truer friend than the Roman Catholic Church. One of the great friends to the cause of social advancement is the Roman Catholic Church. It guards the

home, it guards the family, it guards the child. We ought to make friends with the Roman Catholic Church, and unless we do it, we reject one of the great factors in the cause of the advancement of Christ." *SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.17*

When Mr. Baldwin sat down, Mr. Dodge the President of the Evangelical Alliance, under whose auspices the conference was held, said he was sorry that Mr. Baldwin had so entirely mistaken the sentiment of the Alliance on this question. He said that he knew of no one who had not profound respect for the piety of Roman Catholics, and for the good done by them. The only word that had been uttered was that they did not believe in allegiance to a foreign power, a power that was opposed to our free institutions, especially our public schools, but that for the Catholic Church as a Christian church they had nothing but love and sympathy. Said he: "We will always welcome their assistance, and we will defend with our hearts' blood rights for them that we claim for ourselves." The remarks of Mr. Dodge were interrupted by prolonged applause, and the conference broke out in applause at their close. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.18*

Thus we see how the barriers between Catholicism and Protestantism are being taken away, and it is not the Catholic Church that is making the advances. How long will it be before professed Protestants will begin to condemn Luther? The Catholic Church has not changed a particle; and if it is now one of the great factors in the advancement of the cause of Christ and social reforms, it must have been so in Luther's day; and if so, he made a great mistake. The truth is, the great body of professed Protestants have become so intoxicated with the wine of Rome-the desire for "catholicity" and church supremacy-that they are even now scarcely able to distinguish between Christ and antichrist. *SITI December 22, 1887, page 784.19*

December 29, 1887

"The Decline of Civilization" The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

The San Francisco *Chronicle* has the following editorial comment on the way that Sullivan, America's champion human bull-dog, has been received by royalty in England. The *Chronicle's* comparison is a just one; but it seems to forget that Sullivan went to England with the official indorsement of the most cultured city in the United States, and that the bloody sports of the arena are fully as popular in this country as in England. Rome's decline began with the introduction of gladiatorial shows; why are we not justified in concluding that England and America are going the same way? *SITI December 29, 1887, page 785.1*

A London dispatch says, "The Prince of Wales, who was very much prepossessed by the American's independent, sent his equerry to a well-known jeweler's in Bond Street and ordered a handsome gold watch to be made, bearing the inscription, 'To John L. Sullivan, Boston, U.S.A., with best wishes of Albert Edward, Prince of Wales.'" *SITI December 29, 1887, page 785.2*

Does this carry the reader back at once to the pages of Suetonius and Gibbon, and to the times when the brawny gladiators were the pets and boon companions of the desolute masters and rulers of the Roman Empire? Can we not, in our imagination, see Domitian, given over to those vices which evoked the merciless satire of Juvenal, not the least of which was the emperor's inordinate fondness for the sports of the arena and the delight at the sight of human blood? Does not this gift from the heir of the British throne to John L. Sullivan, with the best wishes of the giver, unavoidably recall the decadence of the Roman Empire, and conjure up the picture of the times when the sect called Christians were butchered to make a Roman holiday, and when cruelty, luxury, and licentiousness reigned supreme in that city which had been the mistress of the world? *SITI December 29, 1887, page 785.3*

And who is the man whom the future king of England so delights to honor, and to whom he extends a token of his admiration and his best wishes? Simply a man who enjoys the notoriety of being the most powerful brute that walks erect; a creature who can strike a harder blow with his fist than any other living animal except the gorilla and the grizzly; a human being who, so far as the record shows, has never done a kindly or manly or generous act in his whole life, who has never used his vast strength for the protection of the weak and feeble, who has never done his country or his kind one moment's service; but who, on the contrary, has been a rowdy, a bully, a swashbuckler, a terror to women and inoffensive men, a drunkard, and a brawler, and altogether a disreputable and wholly useless member of society. This is the man whom Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, heir apparent to the kingly and imperial throne of Great Britain, honors with his presence, and favors with his best wishes. *SITI December 29, 1887, page 785.4*

"The Sure Word" The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we called attention to Peter's statement that the word of prophecy is more sure than the testimony of any eye-witness, and quoted a few prophecies that speak of "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." We wish now to quote a few more of the many prophecies concerning this same thing, that the reader may see how important a place it occupies. And we offer no apology for making copious extracts from the sure word. Certainly nothing that man can write can equal in interest and importance the words of inspiration. *SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.1*

Turning to the book of the prophet Isaiah, we read as follows, beginning with the tenth verse of the second chapter:- *SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.2*

"Enter into the rock, and hide thee in the dust, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty. The lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. For the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every one that is proud and lofty, and upon every one that is lifted up; and he shall be brought low.... And the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be exalted in that day. And the idols he shall utterly abolish. And they shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth. In the day a man shall cast his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which they made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats; to go into the clefts of the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty, when he ariseth to shake the terrible the earth." *SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.3*

This language certainly gives us a vivid idea of the "power and coming" of the Lord. But the holy man of God,

whose lips were touched by a coal from God's own altar, was made the mouth-piece of a still more vivid description of the power that shall attend the coming of the Lord. Again the Holy Spirit moved him to say:-*SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.4*

"Howl ye; for the day of the Lord is at hand; it shall come as a destruction from the Almighty. Therefore shall all hands be faint, and every man's heart shall melt; and they shall be afraid; pangs and sorrows shall take hold of them; they shall be in pain as a woman that travaileth; they shall be amazed one at another; their faces shall be as flames. Behold, the day of the Lord cometh, cruel both with wrath and fierce anger, to lay the land desolate; and he shall destroy the sinners thereof out of it. For the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light; the sun shall be darkened in his going forth, and the moon shall not cause her light to shine. And I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity; and I will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease, and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible. I will make a man more precious than fine gold; even a man than the golden wedge of Ophir. Therefore I will shake the heavens, and the earth shall remove out of her place, in the wrath of the Lord of hosts, and in the day of his fierce anger." *Isaiah 13:6-13. SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.5*

Once more the Lord speaks through his servant:-*SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.6*

"Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof. And it shall be, as with the people, so with the priest; as with the servant, so with his master; as with the maid, so with her mistress; as with the buyer, so with the seller; as with the lender, so with the borrower; as with the taker of usury, so with the giver of usury to him. The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled; for the Lord hath spoken this word. The earth mourneth and fadeth away, the world languisheth and fadeth away, the haughty people of the earth do languish. The earth also is defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant. Therefore hath the curse devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate: therefore the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left." *Isaiah 24:1-6. SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.7*

Who these few men are that are left from the general destruction that overwhelms those who have transgressed the laws, is told through the same prophet in these words:-*SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.8*

"The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings? He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil; He shall dwell on high; his place of defense shall be the munitions of rocks; bread shall be given him; his waters shall be sure. Thine eyes shall see the king in his beauty: they shall behold the land that is very far off." *Isaiah 33:14-17. SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.9*

That these righteous ones are the "few men" who are left after the day of the Lord has laid the land desolate, and destroyed the sinners out of it, is evident from our Saviour's words, recorded in *Matthew 7:13, 14*: "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." *SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.10*

Jeremiah was another "holy man of God," whom the Holy Ghost moved to speak. Like John the Baptist, he was chosen even before his birth to be a prophet unto the nations. When the Lord announced this fact to him (*Jeremiah 1:4, 5*), he said: "Ah, Lord God! behold, I cannot speak; for I am a child. But the Lord said unto me, Say not, I am a child; for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak." *Verses 6, 7*. And the prophet continues: "Then the Lord put forth his hand, and touched my mouth. And the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth." *Verse 9*. What better credentials could any man have than this? *SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.11*

From lips burning with the touch of the Almighty hand, Jeremiah poured forth the words "which the Holy Ghost teacheth." And here is a portion of his word concerning "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ:"-*SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.12*

"Destruction upon destruction is cried; for the whole land is spoiled; suddenly are my tents spoiled, and my curtains in a moment. How long shall I see the standard, and hear the sound of the trumpet? For my people is foolish, they have not known me; they are sottish children, and they have none understanding; they are wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge. I beheld the earth, and, lo, it was without form, and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and, lo, they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and, lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. I beheld, and, lo, the fruitful place was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by

his fierce anger. For thus hath the Lord said, The whole land shall be desolate; yet will I not make a full end." *Jeremiah 4:20-27.SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.13*

We next turn to "the burden which Habakkuk the prophet did see," and read the following word concerning the power of the Lord's coming:-*SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.14*

"God came from Teman, and the Holy One from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. And his brightness was as the light; he had horns coming out of his hand; and there was the hiding of his power." *Habakkuk 3:3, 4.* Compare with these words *2 Thessalonians 2:8*: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." It is the glory of the Lord,-that glory which he received from the Father in the holy mount, and which he had with him before the world was,-that will destroy the winners out of the earth when he comes. But we turn again to the words spoken through Habakkuk:-*SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.15*

"Before him went the pestilence, and burning coals went forth at his feet. He stood, and measured the earth; he beheld, and drove asunder the nations; and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow; his ways are everlasting.... The mountains saw thee, and they trembled; the overflowing of the water passed by; the deep uttered his voice, and lifted up his hands on high. The sun and moon stood still in their habitation; at the light of thine arrows they went, and at the shining of thy glittering spear. Thou didst march through the land in indignation, thou didst thresh the heathen in anger. Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, even for salvation with thine anointed; thou woundedst the head out of the house of the wicked, by discovering the foundation unto the neck." *Habakkuk 3:5-13. W.SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.16*

"Establishment of the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

"Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." *Exodus 20:8-11.SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.17*

If there were no other facts given concerning the Sabbath than those contained in the above commandment, we would still have everything that is needed to guide us to its proper observance. Indeed, since it is the law on the subject, we should expect as much, even without reading it, for a law concerning anything must contain within itself all the affirmation necessary to enable one to obey it understandingly. This is the case with the other precepts of the decalogue. They are explicit, allowing no chance for differences of opinion. The only difference between the fourth commandment and the rest is that it is more full and explicit than any of them.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.18*

But the wise man has truly said, "God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions;" and for no purpose have "inventions" been more persistently sought out than for the purpose of the evading the plain import of this fourth commandment. Many are not satisfied with the simple reading of the law, vainly thinking that somewhere in the record of God's dealings with men, they will find that which will warrant them in disregarding his spoken word. It therefore is necessary to consider everything that has a bearing on the subject.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.19*

It is evident that a law can never mean anything more or less than it did when first pronounced. If the conditions on which the law is based change, or the will of the law-giver changes concerning these conditions, then the law itself may be changed; but such change must be clearly indicated. The terms of the law must be changed, or another law enacted with the express declaration that it is to supersede the first. Until this is done, the original law remains in full force, even though the will of the law-making power should change; for how can the people know the will of the power having authority, unless that will is plainly expressed?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.20*

Again, if any change in a law is made, the new law must not only be expressed in as clear language as the old, but it must be as widely circulated. All who are subject to the law and are expected to keep it, must be informed of the change, or else they cannot keep it. To punish a person for the violation of a law with which he had been allowed to become familiar, would be an act of injustice. God does not so deal with his creatures. In every instance when the execution of his judgments is recorded, we are plainly informed as to the command which was violated; and a penalty is never threatened in the Bible without an explicit statement being made of what course of action will make one liable to that penalty. With the statements, we will proceed to dissect, as it were, the Sabbath law, to see if it really means what it appears to; and we will also see if it has in any way

been modified, or been superseded by another law.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 790.21*

It is evident from the reading of the fourth commandment that the Sabbath did not originate at Sinai. For we are referred to the creation of the earth, and told that the conclusion of that work God "blessed" and "hallowed" the Sabbath day. It must, therefore, have been in existence at that time; a thing that has no existence cannot be blessed, neither can it be hallowed.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 791.1*

This will be still more evident when we consider the meaning of the word "hallow." Webster defines it thus: "To make holy; to set apart for holy or religious use; to consecrate." The word in the original is defined similarly. It is the same word that is rendered "sanctified" in *Genesis 2:3*, and "appoint" in *Joshua 20:7*. The fourth commandment, then, tells us plainly that God commanded the Sabbath to be kept holy in the beginning.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 791.2*

Turning to the first chapter of Genesis we read the record of the first six days of time, in which the heavens and the earth, and all that they contain, were created, the work of each day being specified. At the close of the sixth day God looked for the whole of his creation "and behold, it was a very good." He was satisfied with his work, because it was perfect. The record continues:-*SITI December 29, 1887, page 791.3*

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." *Genesis 2:1-3. SITI December 29, 1887, page 791.4*

We have here the record of the first Sabbath commandment. That in *Exodus 20:8-11* is the same in every respect, being simply a renewal of the commandment as given at creation. In the institution of the Sabbath there was a three-fold act on the part of God. First, he rested on the seventh day. This made that day Sabbath, for Sabbath means rest. Because the Lord rested, it is called the Sabbath, or rest, of the Lord. But this act did not place man under any obligation to rest on that day. If the record stopped here, we would have no interest in it except as a matter of history. Second, God pronounced a blessing upon the day. It was thus exalted above other days in that it was a Sabbath, and blessed; still these two acts were not sufficient to make its observance obligatory on man. Third, he sanctified the day, that is, set it apart for holy for religious use; he appointed that it should be regarded holy. This was the crowning act which placed man under obligation to keep it.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 791.5*

Let it be remembered that it required these three acts to institute the Sabbath in the beginning. It certainly can take nothing less to institute a new Sabbath, should there be such a thing; and therefore whenever we find men claiming that some other day is entitled to recognition as the true Sabbath, we have only to apply these tests: Did God ever rest upon it? Did he ever pronounce a blessing upon it? Did he ever pronounce it holy, and set it apart for sacred observance? If these three questions in regard to any other day cannot be truthfully answered by a simple affirmation, then that day does not approach in honor and sacredness to the original Sabbath of the Lord. Man may rest upon any other day, and that they will thus become his rest, or sabbath; but men cannot pronounce a blessing upon the day, thus elevating it above other days, neither can he sanctify the day; he cannot make it holy, and he has no right to command anybody else to rest upon it. And since there is no record that God ever did these three things for any other day than the seventh, that day stands alone, distinguished above all other days as being the Sabbath of the Lord.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 791.6*

We will go even further, and say that it is an absolute impossibility that the Sabbath should be changed from the original seventh day to any other day. God himself could not do this. In so saying, we do not place any limit upon the power of God, save this, which inspiration itself authorizes, that "he cannot deny himself." The institution of the Sabbath rests upon facts which God himself established. A "fact" is simply something that has been done; and a thing that has been done can never be effaced, so that it will cease to be true that it has been done. The Sabbath rests upon those three facts: (1) In six days God created the heavens and the earth, and rested upon the seventh day; (2) he blessed the seventh day and (3) sanctified, or set it apart as a sacred day for man's observance. And these last two acts he did "because that in it *he had rested* from all his works which God created and made."*SITI December 29, 1887, page 791.7*

Now if it can ever be true that the world was not created in six days, and that God did not rest upon the seventh day, and afterwards bless and sanctify it; in other words, if the word of God can be recalled, so that it shall be as though it had never been spoken; and if the wheels of time can be made to roll backward six thousand years and more, and their tracks be obliterated; and if matters can be so effectually annihilated that it will be a truth that it never existed, then, and not till then, can the seventh day cease to be the Sabbath of the Lord. But it needs no argument to show that this can never be; God cannot deny what he has once said and done; much less can he make it true that he never did the things which he has done. "He cannot deny himself," and so even Omnipotence cannot change the Sabbath of the Lord from the seventh day of the week.

“Job and His Friends” The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

Human nature in the days of Job was just the same as it is now. We have proof of it in the way that Job was treated by his friends. He himself tells how he was regarded in the days when he was “the greatest of all the men of the East,” when the rock poured him out rivers of oil. He says: “The young men saw me, and hid themselves; and the aged a rose, and stood up. The princes refrained talking, and laid their hands on their mouth. The nobles held their peace, and their tongue cleaves to the roof of their mouth.” Still further he shows how ready men were to fawn over him, and how glad to be noticed by him: “Unto me men gave ear, and waited, and kept silence at my counsel. After my words they spake not again; and my speech dropped upon them. And they waited for me as for the rain; and they opened their mouth wide as for the latter rain. If I laughed on them, they believed it not; and the light of my countenance they cast not down.” *SITI December 29, 1887, page 793.1*

That was when he was wealthy; but now that he had lost everything, and was afflicted, his friends had changed. He says: “But now they that are younger than I have me in derision, whose fathers I would have disdained to have set with the dogs of my flock.” The friends of his prosperity had gone, and the vilest of men heaped contempt upon him. More than this, he says, “My kinsfolk have failed, and my familiar friends have forgotten me.” But this state of things did not always last, for “the Lord turned the captivity of Job;” “also the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before.” Now read what happened when this turn had taken place in Job’s fortunes:—*SITI December 29, 1887, page 793.2*

“Then came there unto him all his brethren, and all his sisters, and all they that had been of his acquaintance before, and did eat bread with him in his house; and they bemoaned him, and comforted him over all the evil that the Lord had brought upon him; every man also gave him a piece of money, and every one an earring of gold.” *SITI December 29, 1887, page 793.3*

Plenty of friends now. “All they that had been of his acquaintances *before*” came to see him, “and did eat bread in his house.” They had no doubt eaten bread in his house before; they knew how hospitable he was, and what a good table he always set, and so they were wonderfully rejoiced to learn of the restoration of his fortune. “And they bemoaned him.” Yes, they were very ready to bemoan him then; but if they had come when Job was suffering the greatest poverty and affliction, their comfort would no doubt have been more acceptable. Doubtless they have a plausible excuse for not coming to his aid when he was in distress; they were “very sorry that circumstances made it impossible for them to come,” etc., but they would now show that their affection for him had not waned in the least, by everyone giving him a piece of money, when he had no earthly need of it. *SITI December 29, 1887, page 793.4*

The story of Job and his friends is true to life. Job must have known more of human nature after his affliction than he did before. The friends of his prosperity do not commend themselves to us any more than do those of his adversity. But we do not read that Job became sour and cynical over this revelation of human fickleness. He didn’t jump at the conclusion that there was ‘not an honest man in the world.’ Many people say that or its equivalent; yet there never was a man who said it, who believed it. Every man who said so mentally accepted himself. But while Job learned much of human nature he had also learned much of the divine nature, and he knew there were many in whom the image of God was not wholly obliterated. So we can believe that since Job had seen that “the Lord is very painful and of tender mercy,” he had learned to have a charity for the failings of others. The man who allows affliction to make him sour and morose, fails to learn a great lesson which affliction is designed to teach. If the love of God is shed abroad in the heart, tribulation works only patience. *W.SITI December 29, 1887, page 793.5*

“Creation” The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

THE COMMENTARY.

LESSON 1.—SABBATH, JANUARY 7

1. What did God do in the beginning? *SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.1*

“In the beginning God created the heaven and earth.” *Genesis 1:1. SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.2*

2. By what means was this accomplished? *SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.3*

"By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." "For he spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast." *Psalm 33:6, 9.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.4*

3. Are we to understand from these words that the matter of the earth was not in existence before he spake?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.5*

"Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." *Hebrews 11:3.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.6*

4. Who was the active agent in creation?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.7*

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds." *Hebrews 1:1, 2.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.8*

5. Is there anything that the Son did not make?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.9*

"For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." *Colossians 1:16, 17.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.10*

6. Since it was by the Son that the Father created all things, what is his rightful title?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.11*

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word God." "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made." *John 1:1, 3.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.12*

7. How has the Father addressed the Son?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.13*

"But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." "And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands friends." *Hebrews 1:8, 10.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.14*

8. Then how should he be regarded by all creatures?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.15*

"And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him." *Hebrews 1:6.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.16*

9. In what condition was the earth when it was first spoken into existence?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.17*

"And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." *Genesis 1:2.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.18*

10. After the creation of the substances of the earth, what was the first thing done?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.19*

"And God said, Let there be light; and there was light." *Verse 3.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.20*

11. What next?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.21*

"And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness." *Verse 4.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.22*

12. What did God call the light and the darkness?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.23*

"And God called a light day, and the darkness he called night. And the evening and morning were the first day." *Verse 5.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.24*

13. What do a period of darkness and a period of light together constitute? See *verse 5.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.25*

14. Which always comes first in the formation of a day? *The darkness*. Can you explain why? See notes.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.26*

15. What was done on the second day?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.27*

"And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day." *Genesis 1:6-8.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.28*

16. How is this day's work referred to by Job?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.29*

"He bindeth up the waters in his thick cloud; and the cloud is not granted under them." *Job 26:8.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.30*

17. What was done on the third day?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.31*

"And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear; and it was so. And God called the dry land earth; and the gathering together of the waters called he seas; and God saw that it was good. And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass, and herb yielding seed after his kind, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind; and God saw that it was good. And the evening and the morning were the third day." *Genesis 1:9-13.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.32*

18. What was made upon the fourth day?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.33*

"And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years." *Verse 14.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.34*

19. What were these lights to govern?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.35*

"And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night; he made the stars also." *Verse 16.SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.36*

20. Then what kind of days were these days of creation?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.37*

21. Does the sun *make* the day, or simply rule the day?*SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.38*

22. Tell what makes the day, and how there could be days before the sun was. *SITI December 29, 1887, page 794.39*

NOTES

The reverent reader of the Bible, who accepts the historical portion of the Old Testament, as a narrative of what actually took place, and not as a fiction, can arrive at no other conclusion than that the days of creation were literal days of twenty-four hours each. They were days composed of an evening and a morning,-a period of darkness and a period of light; and there were such days as are governed by the sun and moon. Now in order that there should be any show of reason in the claim that the days of creation were long, indefinite periods of time, those who make such a claim ought to be able to point to some time when the sun ruled such days is that. That, of course, would be an impossibility, and so is it an absurdity to claim that the days of creation were anything other than literal, twenty-four hour days. Nobody can get any other idea from the text.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 795.1*

But the question is presented, "How could there be days before there was any sun?" Such a question implies ignorance, or at least forgetfulness, of what forms the day. The day is made by the revolution of the earth on its axis. Each complete revolution makes one day. As a matter of fact, the sun has nothing whatever to do informing the day. If it should suddenly become a body of darkness, instead of a body of light, it would be days just the same, and they would be just the same length that they now are. So there were days before the sun was appointed to rule the day. This appointment was not made until after the earth had completed three revolutions, or until three days of time had passed. The very statement that God set the two great lights in the firmament, "to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness," shows that there were days independent of the sun. These great lights were to rule in the day and then the night, which had been arranged before they were given their office.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 795.2*

When does the day begin? At evening, according to the record in *Genesis 1*; and *Leviticus 23:32* we read that the Jews are directed to celebrate their Sabbaths "from even unto even," and this could not be unless they regarded other days as beginning at the same time. But why is this? Is it an arbitrary requirement? or is there a fixed reason why the day begins at evening? It is not an arbitrary matter, but the natural day begins at

evening because it cannot by any possibility begin at any other time. With the earth was created "darkness was upon the face of the deep." The phrase, "in the beginning," marks the beginning of time, as distinguished from God's eternity. The speaking of the matter of the earth into existence, marked the beginning of the first day of time.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 795.3*

But darkness covered the chaotic mass, and consequently the first day of time began in darkness. Before the earth had completed its first revolution, however, light was created. "And God said, Let there be light; and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night. And the evening [the darkness] and the morning [the light] were the first day." *Genesis 1:3-5*. The first revolution of the earth was completed just at the dividing line between light and darkness; and so, just as the first day began in the unbroken darkness, the second day began with the darkness that had been separated, and put within bounds. And as a matter of necessity, this order must always follow. To make the day actually begin at any other time than evening, would involve a change in the earth's revolution; and in order to count the day as beginning at midnight, a portion of time had to be ignored. Thus it is evident that the present popular mode of reckoning time is not of God's arrangement.*W. SITI December 29, 1887, page 795.4*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

We will send the index of volume 13 to anyone who will send a stamp to pay postage. Of course those who keep their papers on file will want the index.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.1*

The President's Jubilee gift to the Pope is a copy of the Constitution of the United States, beautifully engrossed, and richly bound in book form. Now let somebody send him a copy of the ten commandments, and his library will be complete.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.2*

We may now expect the Pope to take a more active part than ever in the controversy between England and Ireland. A Catholic priest has been sentenced to imprisonment for one month in Ireland, and a prominent Irish official has gone to Rome expressly to enlist the Pope on the side of Ireland.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.3*

In the discussion of the paper on the "Necessity of Co-operation in Christian Work," at the late meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, many sweet things were said about union, etc., but Dr. Washington Gladden looked at the matter from the hard common-sense rather than the sentimental standpoint. Said he: "There is too much talk, too much gush, and not enough practice. Profession should halt till practice catches up." He also said that he did not think much of union revival meetings. He compared such "wholesale evangelization" to trying to warm a great city by a bonfire in a public square instead of by fires in the houses. This comparison may be meditated upon with profit.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.4*

The *Hebrew Journal*, speaking of the first advent of Christ, says:-*SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.5*

"The Jews of that time, full of the conceit of their own goodness, and contempt for the Gentiles' wickedness, expecting, too, a warrior Saviour, rejected him; but what if he came now, when we can appreciate, understand, and rightly value of the sweetness, usefulness, nobility, and elevation of his teachings?"*SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.6*

Yes, what if he should? Why, they would accept him, of course. No, indeed they would not, if he should come in the same way that he came eighteen hundred years ago. But the National Reformers are planning for a coming of Christ such as they will accept. They are going to have him come just as the ancient Jews wanted him to come, and it will involve no self-denial to accept him. Indeed, all the self-denial that will be called for will be on the part of those who refuse to enroll themselves in the National Reform kingdom.*SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.7*

At the Howard Street M. E. Church, Rev. Dr. Harcourt preached a sermon Christmas-day on the immortality of the soul, which question he settled to his own satisfaction, as follows:-*SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.8*

"The great question that concerns us is, 'Does death end all?' Has man ceased to be, when the physical is destroyed? The conclusions of the materialists we cannot accept. They are neither reasonable nor religious. It is impossible to account for the existence of an organized brain without a pre-existing mind through and by which it was produced and developed." *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.9*

From his conclusion we should suppose that the question was not, "Does death end all?" But, "Does birth begin all?" His argument makes solely for the pre-existence of souls, and not only that, but it makes the soul the creator of the physical organism in which it dwells. In other words, it is but the old Platonic theory that men

are gods. It is an evidence of the fact that the doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul cannot be argued without the use of pagan arguments. The doctrine does away with the necessity for one God, the Creator of all things; it tends only to paganism, and to pagan morality, which is immortality. *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.10*

The *Christian Advocate* (N. Y.) tells of a Presbyterian minister in New Jersey who opposed raffling in church fairs, and "his action made so much disturbance that he announced a few days ago that he should lay his resignation before the Presbytery." We have no doubt that there was quite a disturbance also in the temple when Jesus drove out the money-changers and them that sold doves. But he drove them out nevertheless. And yet their traffic was entirely decent and honorable as compared with raffling. Theirs were legitimate transactions anywhere except in the house of God, while raffling is nothing but gambling anywhere. Query: If that which was legitimate business anywhere else, made the house of God a den of thieves when transacted there, then what does that which is thieving everywhere make the house of God when conducted there? *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.11*

The following is a translation of an item that appeared in *El Pueblo*, of October 13, a paper published in Chihuahua, Mexico:- *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.12*

"Last Sunday a bull-fight was given by amateurs for the purpose of devoting the receipts to the interior adornment of the parish church. The assemblage were pleased and satisfied; with reason, if some persons were bruised." *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.13*

The *Independent* says that this series of performances has been kept up on Sunday afternoons. It says also:- *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.14*

"A few months ago in Southern Mexico a bull-ring was dedicated with religious ceremonies conducted by a priest. It is by no means an unknown thing for a Mexican priest to live openly with his mistress and his children about him in the residence near the church edifice." *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.15*

And this is a fair specimen of the morality of Catholic countries. Catholics are fond of pointing to the wonderful educational facilities which they provide for their people in this country, as evidence of the progressive nature of Catholicism, but that proves nothing; the only way we can properly understand what Catholicism is, and what it does for the people, is to look at it in countries where it has full swing. Mexico has been under Catholic control for more than three hundred years; if Catholicism has in it anything of an elevating nature, and is so great an educator and civilizer as is claimed, Mexico ought to be in advance of the United States. But the fact is, Catholicism in the United States is brought in contact with enlightened Protestantism, and is forced to make a show of advancement in sheer self-defense. *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.16*

While we speak thus disparagingly of Catholicism we say nothing whatever of individual Catholics. There are thousands of honest men in the Roman Catholic Church, and many of them will yet renounce its errors. But Roman Catholicism, as a system of religion, can do nothing to elevate men, for it is but the "mystery of iniquity," and many men who under other circumstances would have been upright, moral men, have been ruined simply because of their connection with the system. *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.17*

The White Cross movement is bound to be a prodigious success now! Social purity is now in a fair way to be fully assured to all the world! for the devil has espoused the cause, and nowadays when that very respectable dignitary endorses a thing it is pretty apt to be very generally received. Sunday evening, December 18, in San Francisco, W. J. Colville, one of the leading Spiritualists of the country, the leading "inspirational speaker," and the leading teacher of the Spiritualistic "science," gave an "inspirational" discourse on the White Cross movement, in which the author of his inspiration set forth sentiments in which he made himself to appear almost as an angel of light. He said it was intended to become so universal as to reach into every civilized country and people. It is altogether likely that it will, but wherever it may reach, the indorsement of Spiritualism will be its worst curse and the heaviest burden that it will ever be called upon to bear. *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.18*

"The Promoter of Sin" The Signs of the Times, 13, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

The author of the "Philosophy of the Plan of Salvation" truly says: "All happy obedience must arise from affection, exercised toward the object obeyed. Obedience which arises from affection, blesses the spirit which yields it, if the conscience approve of the object obeyed, while, on the contrary, no being can be happy in obeying one whom he does not love. To obey a parent, or to obey God, from interested motives would be sin. The devil might be obeyed for the same reason. All enlightened minds agree to what the Bible confirms, and what reason can clearly perceive without argument, that love for God is essential to every act of religious duty.

To tender obedience or homage to God, while we have no love for him in our hearts, would be dishonorable to the Maker, and doing violence to our own nature." *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.19*

Than this we know of no paragraph in all literature that more clearly reveals the essential wickedness of all enforced conformity to religious duties, and therefore the wicked cruelty of all State interference in religious things. "No being can be happy in obeying one whom he does not love." Therefore for Governments to compel men to conform to duty toward God, while bearing in their hearts no love for him, is only to compel men to sin, because, saith the Scriptures, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." While for the State to offer inducements to men, that would lead them to conform to religious duties from interested motives, would also be sin. "To tender obedience or homage to God while we have no love for him in our hearts, would be dishonorable to the Maker, and doing violence to our own nature." Now such is precisely what the National Reform scheme proposes to do to the people of this nation. The National Reformers propose to compel men to tender obedience and homage to God, while they have no love for him in their hearts. Therefore the direct result of the triumph of National Reform principles will be to compel men to dishonor their Maker and do violence to their own natures, and thus vastly to increase the ratio of sin in the nation and hasten its destruction. *SITI December 29, 1887, page 800.20*

